

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 1879.

The Week.

THREE months of bill-framing, bill-passing, caucussing, and sustaining vetoes have convinced the Democrats in Congress that they cannot get along without the President. On Thursday, therefore, they resigned themselves to the inevitable, and brought into the House, not the Legislative Appropriation Bill shorn of the obnoxious rider, but a bill containing the appropriations of the current fiscal year (ending June 30), with numerous exceptions tacked on at the end, and with the omission of the rider as well as of all provision for the expenses of the Federal courts, which are to run the gauntlet of the White House in a separate measure. The Republicans making no opposition, it was passed on Monday by 118 to 21, the latter number representing the total army of thick-and-thin "revolutionists," of whom four were from the North, two from Missouri, and the rest from south of Mason & Dixon's line. On Thursday the Senate passed, after a warm debate, by 30 to 18, the bill repealing §§801, 820, 821 of the Revised Statutes, and making new provision for the drawing of jurors. Mr. Edmunds played, as he has done so much of late, the rôle of recording angel to the Democratic party, by offering amendments sure to be defeated, but sure to cause a flutter in the enemy's camp and to make voting them down uncomfortable. His principal test of this kind was a proviso that no disqualification on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude should be allowed in a United States or State court. When objection was made to the insertion of State court, Mr. Edmunds showed that the law of 1875 contained the identical prohibition, but he did not mention that Mr. Thurman's motion to strike it out at the time was supported by Senators Schurz, Ferry of Connecticut, Carpenter, Tipton, Sprague, and other Republicans. However, the Democrats rejected the amendment even without the State court. Mr. Edmunds and others objected with reason to the feature of the bill which directs that the special commissioner who makes up the jury-list with the clerk of the court shall be a "well-known member of the principal political party opposing that to which the clerk may belong." On Thursday the House passed the Supplemental Appropriation Bill, for judicial expenses, embodying also the Senate Jurors' Bill, amended for the better, and including the prohibition against color discrimination in the Federal courts.

The Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections resumed last Saturday the examination of the witnesses in the Kellogg-Spofford case. The principal witness was a mulatto who calls himself De Lacy and says he is of Irish parentage, his grandfather having been "Sir Hugh de Lacy." He was himself one of the negroes who, having been first a member of the Packard Legislature which elected Kellogg to the Senate, afterwards went over to the Nicholls Legislature and there helped to elect Spofford. He was called as a witness for Spofford to prove that money had been paid to secure Kellogg's election, he having made an affidavit to that effect. On taking the stand, however, he denied all knowledge of the subject, though he very frankly admitted that he had agreed to make such a statement, and that it was all a lie, and that he rather liked to tell a "social lie" once in a while, though statements made under oath he regarded in a different light. He disavowed the affidavit, calling the attention of the Committee to the fact that the name De Lacy was spelled *De Lacey*; though he afterwards admitted that he sometimes spelled it in this way "when in a hurry." Charles Cavanac swore that De Lacy offered to him to make the affidavit he denied on the stand, and had told him his story of bribery by Kellogg. Thomas Murray, a negro, related a conversation with

him in which De Lacy asked how much money "there was in it," when Murray told him that he, Murray, expected to make \$2,500 out of it. He subsequently explained that he expected to make this because "it would be worth \$2,500 to have the good people of his community with him." John Seveignes, another witness, "descended from an old French family," swore that he was a member of the Packard Legislature in 1877 and voted for Kellogg; that he had made an affidavit to the effect that he was not present when Kellogg was voted for, and that this affidavit was "a blunt, straightforward lie," but that it was made from an honorable desire "to show how things were done." The Committee, unaided by the press, might have some difficulty in making out the exact value of such testimony as this, and we may therefore call their attention to the simple rule adopted by the *Tribune* and *Times*—i.e., all testimony which makes in favor of Kellogg is true, all the rest is false. The witnesses are generally arrested and committed for perjury as soon as their testimony is ended, and are, curiously enough, generally custom-house officers.

The prospect of the appearance of philanthropic Northern steamers on the Mississippi to carry colored people away to Kansas has so alarmed the planters, that a convention of those of Washington County have drawn up an address to Northern "business men and benevolent societies," protesting against their lending countenance to any such scheme, on the ground that, though the negroes were not badly treated in Mississippi, their imaginations would be so fired by the proposal to carry them to "fresh woods and pastures new" that even the well-to-do would abandon their homes, and utterly disorganize the industry of the State. There is doubtless a great deal of truth in all this; but the sober and sensible and conservative planters who sign addresses of this kind ought to know that a little personal activity on their part in putting down lawlessness in the State would, in a very few years, make it as absurd to send steamboats to carry off its laborers as to send them up the Connecticut River for a similar purpose. The negro is such excellent material for electioneering purposes at the North that Southerners need have little hope of taking him out of politics until they police themselves better.

The movement which these Mississippi planters dread is the one promoted by General T. B. Conway, who is collecting subscriptions to enable him to take a steamer down the Mississippi to carry off intending emigrants, whom he is going to deposit in Wisconsin, General Butler having promised him 17,000 acres of land for the purpose; and he has, he says, agents in half a dozen States engaging employment for colored emigrants among the farmers. We sincerely trust, however, that none but the really destitute will avail themselves of General Conway's munificent offers. We are quite sure that a negro who owns anything will be better off in his own home than on General Conway's boat or General Butler's land-grant. It is a curious fact that at the meeting held in aid of the Conway movement in this city on Monday evening the only person who spoke of war and seemed to be prepared for battle was a clergyman—the Rev. Dr. Newman. He assumed that the use of the Mississippi as "a highway" by the Conway boat would be resisted by force, and announced, amid thunders of applause, that in that case "the people of the North would make it a highway." In fact, within a few weeks an extraordinary number of ministers have been heard sharpening their swords.

The Ohio Democratic platform is a commonplace rather than a "ringing" document. It demands "free and fair elections," insists that the laws enacted by Congress under pretence of "regulating the manner of Congressional elections" are unconstitutional

and ought to be repealed, and that they are also "instrumentalities of fraud, force, and corruption"; declares that impartial juries are necessary to the preservation of liberty, and that juries have been "packed," and demands that they shall be so "packed" no longer; that the Republican minority in Congress, and the President by his use of the veto power, have shown a spirit of faction; urges Congress to refuse to appropriate a dollar "to pay soldiers, marshals, deputy-marshals, or supervisors of election, to interfere with or control the elections"; castigates the Republicans; reaffirms the financial principles of the party—i.e., that the issue of money is a function of Government, that the national banks ought to be broken up, and Treasury notes substituted for bank-notes; denounces the demonetization of silver as a fraud in the interest of the bondholders; deplors the rapid increase of the interest-bearing debt, and demands that "it be put in process of extinction"; defends the Legislature against Republican attacks, and insists that the right of expatriation must be recognized by the German Empire. General Ewing, their nominee for Governor, was a distinguished officer in the war, and his selection is for this reason chuckled over as an effective mode of getting round the Stalwarts; but he is also one of the foremost Greenbackers in the country. The Ohio Nationals also held a convention on the 4th instant. The delegates are said, by the correspondent of the Cincinnati *Gazette*, to have been on the whole "an exceedingly fine-looking, earnest, business-like set of men." There is no doubt they are earnest, for the platform demands the immediate repudiation of the national debt, and this has already led to a bolt; so that the probable effect of the party in the campaign is very difficult at its present stage to estimate.

There is nothing new in the Presidential field beyond the rapid decline of the Grant "boom," and the abandonment of the scheme of welcoming him with a monster procession across the continent, known of late as "the hippodrome." Mr. Sherman's pretensions attract more attention than anybody's, and the New York *Times* maliciously calls attention to the fact that, as the Republican party at the South now consists almost exclusively of Treasury officials, Mr. Sherman will be able to send up solid Sherman delegations from all the Southern States to the convention. How any paper can be so evil-minded and uncharitable it is difficult to imagine.

A most entertaining paragraph in the Boston *Journal* alleges in reply to the *Nation* that the sectional controversy was not revived by the Republicans in 1876. We are glad to read a statement of this kind in a Stalwart Republican paper, because it shows at least the existence of a certain shame; but unhappily there is not one word of truth in it. Republican speakers and press, beginning with Vice-President Wheeler's opening speech in Vermont, spoke of hardly anything but the Southern question, to which, at the cost of much obloquy, we kept calling attention every week as dangerous and discreditable. The finances and civil-service reform and almost everything else were totally ignored. We may call as one witness on this point whose testimony the *Journal* will not question the eminent Mr. William E. Chandler. That statesman, being much dissatisfied with the new President, published a letter to the New Hampshire Republicans in the last week of December, 1877, in which he reproached Mr. Hayes with perfidy on the ground that his "campaign was carried on, so far as methods and utterances were concerned, in no respect differently from the campaigns of 1868 and 1872"; "'the bloody shirt,' as it is termed, was," said he, "freely waved, and Governor Hayes himself urged prominent public men to put forward as our best argument the dangers of rebel rule and a solid South." In fact, we can recall nothing in recent political history more audacious than the pretence that it is "the Brigadiers" in the present Congress who have revived the sectional controversy.

The way the revival of the controversy was arranged by the Republican chiefs was instructively illustrated in Mr. Wheeler's case.

His letter of acceptance, written in July, 1876, following the line of the platform, was moderate and conciliatory, giving the principal place to the currency and civil-service reform question. A month later he delivered the opening speech of the campaign in Vermont, doubtless having in the meantime received his instructions, and we cannot describe its nature better than in our own summary of it in our issue of Aug. 31, 1876:

"Mr. Wheeler spoke in Vermont, and devoted himself exclusively to reminiscences of the rebellion, showing how many 'ex-rebels' there were in the House last winter, how bitter and unrepentant they were, how completely identical in spirit they were with the 'Missouri Border-ruffians' twenty years ago in Kansas, how entirely the South was in the hands of these men; and he alleged, as of his own knowledge, that the Southern people 'regarded the amendments of the Constitution in reference to slavery, and the laws for the protection of freedmen, as the French provinces did their cession to Prussia at the point of the bayonet.' He described the issue in the present canvass as 'the old issue' of the war, and represented the approaching election as a sort of continuance of 'the work so effectively done by your bayonets at Gettysburg.' Not one word of allusion to reform of any kind in the Government; not a hint of the need of any reform."

In truth the twist given to the canvass, after Mr. Hayes's nomination, was the wickedest thing done by politicians since the attack on Fort Sumter.

The investigation by the Pennsylvania Legislature of the charges of corruption brought against some of its members in connection with the Pittsburgh Riot Relief Bill has ended, as such investigations are pretty sure to end, in the failure of the attempt to expel the guilty members. The bill appropriated \$4,000,000 to pay for part of the losses growing out of the railroad riots of 1877, and in itself it would seem as if there was great propriety in the State of Pennsylvania taking upon itself the payment of these losses, since it was certainly responsible for the unexpected proportions the riot assumed. For two or three days a mob of ruffians and thieves held complete possession of the city of Pittsburgh, and although it was patent from the beginning that the county authorities were either in sympathy with the rioters or powerless to restore order, they were allowed to burn and sack to their hearts' content. The responsibility for such things must necessarily rest upon the State which permits them, and there was nothing more pitiable connected with the riots of 1877 than the helpless appeals from large and powerful States to the general Government, for aid in repressing a disturbance which a well-organized militia would have been perfectly competent to cope with.

All this, of course, has nothing to do with the question of the means used to forward the passage of the Riot Relief Bill, which seem to have embraced the most unblushing corruption of members of the Legislature. Most of those approached appear to have succumbed, while the testimony taken also disclosed facts implicating a number of officials outside the Legislature. The cases of these gentlemen the Legislature evidently considered more important than its own; for, after refusing to unseat the members involved, it immediately proceeded to direct the institution of criminal proceedings against the officials in question. The Philadelphia *Bulletin*, which takes a very severe view of the matter, thinks that the worst of it is that, under the biennial system now in force in Pennsylvania, it will necessarily be a year before the people have an opportunity of expressing their opinion of the transaction. It must be admitted that this is an objection to the biennial system which has been hitherto overlooked. Biennial sessions have generally been advocated because they would give the public only half as much legislation as it had had before. Whether this is a compensation for the loss of the annual opportunity to make bad members of the Legislature take "back seats," is a question for publicists to consider.

The Supreme Court of Tennessee has rendered a decision declaring the act of that State repealing the charter of the city of Memphis constitutional. It will be remembered that the

Legislature created in the place of the old municipal government a new organization, known as a Taxing District, consisting of various bodies charged with the duties ordinarily performed by branches of a city government, some of the members being appointed by the governor with the consent of the Senate or the courts, others being chosen by the qualified voters. The duration of the new system was limited to two years; and, practically, the result of the act was to put the city government into commission for that time. It was contended that this was a departure from democratic usages, on the ground that it violated the rule that taxation and representation should go together; that inasmuch as the "Taxing District" was merely the city under a new name, the taxes must be levied by the corporation itself. The court, however, held that wherever compulsory taxation is found necessary to compel a city to perform properly its duties as an agency in State government, or to fulfil any obligation legally or equitably resting on it in consequence of the action of such a body, the State has ample power to provide for the necessary taxation, and *the people to be taxed have no absolute right to a voice in determining whether it shall be levied*, except through their representatives in the Legislature. The decision announces no new principle of law, but merely applies well-established principles to a novel case. The case has an important moral, however, for the thousand and one cities and towns scattered through the United States which have pushed their right of creating debt dangerously near the point of insolvency.

There was an active speculation during the week in silver bullion in London, where the price advanced from 52½d. per oz. to 52¾d. to 52¾d., from which it subsequently fell to 51¾d., the closing price. The speculation there was assisted by a demand for China to pay for silk, and by reports that the German Government had decided to withhold sales for the present. No one there or here took much account of the Warner Silver Bill, because it was understood that it could not become a law. Here the price of bullion changed, so that 412½ grains, the amount in a standard dollar, was worth as much as about 89½ cents, and as little as 87 cents; at the close the bullion value of this dollar was \$0.87001. Exchange on London, where the discount rate in the outside market advanced to 1½ per cent. from 1 per cent., was firm at little below the gold-coin exporting point. Although below, one firm shipped \$700,000 gold coin during the week, for reasons outside of those which govern the general market. Early in the week U. S. bonds declined, but in the latter part there was more demand for the 4 per cents. The national banks have the choice of taking these bonds—the only class of which there is an adequate market supply—or of giving up their note circulation. All first-class railroad investments were strong even to stocks, the most notable example of which was New York and New Haven, which pays scant 10 per cent. annually, and for which 171 was at one time bid. The working of the money market was towards ease, although the surplus bank reserve was increased so as to amount to only about \$5,000,000. The money lost to the market in the last few weeks has, however, gone into the Treasury, and will come back again in payment for called bonds and July interest. The Stock Exchange was quiet. Mercantile business was active for the season; and the outlook for the staple crops South and West was good.

The promoters of the Emma Mining Company in England continue to receive hard treatment in the courts. Messrs. Lewis & Son, the metal-brokers in Liverpool, were sued by some of the purchasers of the stock for the sum they paid for their shares, on the ground that the defendants had conspired with Trenor W. Park and others to sell the mine for more than it was worth. The plaintiffs got a verdict for the full amount with interest, which the full court, on appeal, refused to disturb.

The weight which should be attached to Mr. McCulloch's speculations about the growth of the bi-metallic movement in England is

illustrated by the statement of the last number of the *Economist*, that "the defection of the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce shows how practical men, who ought to be superior to such delusions, can bring themselves to believe in the efficacy of legislative enactments that 15½ grains of silver shall be worth exactly 1 grain of gold, and will keep them so." Moreover, the *Calcutta Englishman*, the leading Indian paper, treats the Liverpool Chamber's resolutions as a delusion also, and wonders how sensible men can imagine that by declaring silver to be worth so much more in relation to gold the world's monetary wealth would be correspondingly increased. In Mr. Stanhope's recent statement of Indian finance, too, although the annual loss on exchange through the depreciation of silver was acknowledged to be about £3,000,000 sterling, the only suggestion of bi-metallism as a remedy came from an obscure member, to whom nobody replied but Mr. Lowe, and he somewhat slightly.

The Indian financial statement was not very satisfactory, and was only made palatable to the House of Commons by the announcement that a decided reduction in expenditures had been resolved on. There was a deficit in the year 1877-8 of £3,543,057, apart from nearly £5,000,000 allotted to public works. In the current year, although the revenue has been increased by nearly £7,000,000, the deficit was £1,355,000, still leaving the public works aside. The causes of this continued deficiency in spite of increased taxation are partly the military outlay caused by the Afghan war, and partly the loss on exchange. The consequence is that the outlay on public works has had to be greatly reduced, and the reserve fund for provision against famines has been swept away; and as taxation has been carried to its last limits there is nothing left for it but to cut down expenses. This is to be effected by military reforms and the employment of more natives in the civil service, as they can be had for less pay than the Europeans. How valuable the treaty with Yakub Khan is, does not yet clearly appear. The Indian Government does not guarantee his title, and what his title is worth without a guarantee has yet to be seen.

The confession of the Government in England that expenditure must be reduced in India, which disarmed the Opposition in the debate; the peace with Yakub Khan, by which he surrenders no territory (the occupied passes do not belong to him); pays no indemnity, but receives \$300,000 as long as he observes the treaty, and has his territory guaranteed against foreign attack (but not against home disputes, and his brother is now in the field against him), and obtains, as far as England is concerned, undisputed possession of his throne; the transfer of the management of the South African campaign to Sir Garnet Wolseley, and the submission to the retirement of the Turks from the Balkans and the cessation of all talk of "reform" in Asia Minor, are generally accepted in England as the abandonment by the Ministry of "the Imperial policy," and as preparation for the elections by the old Gladstonian plan of peace and retrenchment. In fact, they see the truth of the Duke of Argyll's remark, that "they are beginning to be found out."

The troubles in Eastern Rumelia, now that the Sultan has agreed not to occupy the Balkans, have dwindled down to the question of what kind of head-covering the new governor, Aleko Pasha, is to wear. The Sultan, who clings all the more tenaciously to the signs of power as the substance of it is vanishing, insisted on his wearing the fez, a red cap which has for forty years been the official head-dress of the Turkish Empire, to show that he was a Turkish officer. The Bulgarians, on the other hand, wished him to wear the "stove-pipe" hat of the western world, to show that he was not a pasha of the old type. Aleko himself appears to be a thorough Bulgarian at heart, and determined to administer the province for its own benefit, so he has adopted a compromise, suggested it is said by the Russians, by wearing the Bulgarian calpak, or fur cap of the peasantry.

THE NEED OF "SMARTNESS" IN POLITICS.

THE Democrats have been encouraged in much of their policy during the past three months by the reflection that they have been only imitating the action of the Republicans, in cases where the latter happened to be bent on something to which the President for the time being was opposed. But they have overlooked the fact that even in "coercing the President" the Republicans showed themselves practical men—that is to say, they never began to coerce a President without being perfectly sure that they would end by getting the better of him. They never undertook such a task as the Democrats have undertaken without having a two-thirds majority in both houses, and thus being able to overcome the veto beyond any manner of doubt. Undertaking with a bare majority to pass measures to which the party to which the President belongs was opposed, would only have been justified by positive information that the President would disregard his party obligations sufficiently to sign them. But that the Democrats had no such information when they began the late struggle, was shown by the fact that they fastened their various amendments to the appropriation bills, which of course would not have been necessary had they known that the President agreed with them. It may be said that even in the absence of such information they were fairly justified in trying their luck with such legislation as their constituents called for, or as in their judgment the interests of the country seemed to require; but in that case also there was no need to present this legislation in the form of a menace by which the moderate portion of the country was sure to be alarmed or provoked.

They might have satisfied their constituents or their own sense of duty by putting the proposed changes in the law in the form of independent bills, and then, had the President vetoed them, they had a ready defence for taking no further action in the fact that they are not two-thirds of either house. Not being two-thirds of either house, their sole remedy for the veto lay in an appeal to the country at the polls. For although it has often been asserted, apropos of the present controversy, that the power of legislation under the Constitution resides in the majority of both houses of Congress, this is not strictly correct. It resides in two-thirds of both houses. Anything less than two-thirds only possesses the power of legislation in conjunction with the President—or, in other words, only possesses it conditionally. In case it disagrees with the President its remedy is to ask for a popular decision.

This decision the Democrats might have demanded with considerable *éclat*, for the Republicans were not at the outset steady, consistent, or united in their opposition to the change in the Army Bill. The principal objection of many of them to it was that the persons proposing it were bad fellows with evil designs. The Democrats might have met this triumphantly by a course of studied moderation, instead of which they at once proceeded to justify their opponents by putting their schemes in such shape as to warrant the belief that they meant, if they could not carry them, to leave the Government without funds. The Republicans have been guilty during the past eighteen years of a great many high-handed measures which will ill bear examination in quiet times, but they have never been guilty of attempting anything high-handed which they were either afraid to perform or totally unable to perform, and they thus saved themselves from ever becoming grossly ridiculous. Their quarrel with Andrew Johnson, for instance, which presented many situations like that in which the Democrats now find themselves, was marked by many ludicrous features, but it was carried on vigorously by men who knew from the outset what they could do, and did it. The impeachment may seem to constitute an exception, but when it was undertaken there was every reason to believe that the requisite two-thirds vote in the Senate would be forthcoming. It never would have been undertaken if there had from the outset been not the smallest chance of a two-thirds vote.

It must be admitted, as the world goes, that next to a reputation for high principle, the best thing for a party to have is a repu-

tation for shrewdness. Parties, like individual men, can achieve considerable success merely by being thought able to manage their affairs well, even on a low moral plane. Society puts up a good deal too much with clever knaves, but knavish blockheads it cannot abide. The Democratic party, as a correspondent points out elsewhere, has deplorably little to boast of in the way of moral character, but it could achieve considerable success in spite of this if it were only managed with dexterity and force. If its leading men were agreed even on a bad policy, and pushed it with vigor and efficiency, it would derive a certain respectability from it. If the party had had a two-thirds majority in the present Congress, and had used it to repeal all the obnoxious legislation of the war—or, to speak more correctly, all legislation intended to bear specially on the South—the country would have accepted it with resignation if not with content. People would have bowed to a display of real power even if they condemned the use made of it. But the Democrats have talked and acted as if they had a two-thirds majority when they had really only a majority of twelve or fifteen, and the result has been at the last a kind of mental collapse, which disgusts people even more than immorality. The effect of this collapse is made all the greater by the fact that the public has been used now for a great many years to a strong government. That is, it has been used, whether for good or ill, to seeing the party in office a powerful, determined party, which knew what it wanted and how to get it. The love of strong government thus produced finds expression among the Republicans in the Grant movement, and there is no doubt the Democrats too have been considerably affected by it. The latter would, perhaps, object just now to a strong executive, but they are no more ready for a weak, vacillating legislative majority, or for party managers who do not know what they are driving at and handle their tools clumsily, than the Republicans are. The Democratic rank and file were undoubtedly vexed and humiliated by the way the chiefs allowed themselves to be "euchred" in the last Presidential canvass and count, and in the after-negotiations for the purchase of the carpet-baggers; and this vexation and humiliation are likely to be much increased by the recent performances in Congress. The only excuse for not being practical in politics which the average American voter will accept, is goodness. He pardons simplicity and stupidity in a truly good man; but he cannot pardon it in a man who sets up to be as smart as anybody, and full of resource, and not particular about means, and yet allows himself to be foiled by his enemies in everything he undertakes. The Democrats might have retired from the present attempts at legislation with excellent materials for an appeal to the people, had they retired before a simple veto on an independent measure. But they retire now, in spite of all they can say, with the air of being very weak and of having been found out; which is a very unpleasant predicament for either a party or a man.

RELIGIOUS BELLICOSENESS.

A CORRESPONDENT, writing from Illinois, whose letter we publish on another page, takes a somewhat gloomy view of the future relations of the Northern and Southern States of the Union—gloomier, we feel sure, than the facts will warrant. But that he has touched on one of the great obstacles in the way of the restoration of harmony can hardly be denied. The principal one we still hold to be the humane interest of the North in the condition of the negro. This would be, however, we have little doubt, a healing influence rather than an irritating influence, if the negro's condition imposed the same duties and responsibilities on all parts of the Union. But it is one of the misfortunes of the negro problem that it presents itself in a different way to each of the two great divisions of whites who have to effect a common solution of it. The Northern people, who have the fairest conception of the negro's rights and take the most hopeful view of his future, and have much more experience and patience than Southerners in dealing with helplessness and misfortune, have and can have no direct part in his social training. Moreover, they are completely exempt from the conse-

quences of his mental and moral defects—almost as much so as if he lived in Mexico.

The place of actual contact with him and direct experience of the difficulty of working with him would, however, be readily supplied by sympathetic imagination if it were not for the way in which his emancipation was brought about. If the Southern whites were simply countrymen of another region afflicted with an immense mass of ignorance and pauperism, there would be a larger amount at the North of that silent toleration which is now accorded to the groans of the Californian over the Chinese, and of the Western man over the Indians. Good people in this part of the country might not approve of their state of mind about the negro or of their method of dealing with him, but there would be a great deal of covert patience with it, and a great deal of reluctance to criticise it in too absolute a temper. The fact that the Southern white was recently a public enemy deprives him of the benefit of this toleration and turns all presumptions against him, and makes all his difficulties with the negro wear the air, not of struggles of an ill-trained man with a social problem which would disorganize any State at the North, but of efforts to get rid of the legitimate consequences of a bloody revolt brought on by himself. These things make the situation at the South in many ways unique, and suggest the question whether any change so likely to exert a wholesome influence on public opinion could occur as the diffusion of the negroes through the whole country in equal proportions. In this way the responsibilities and duties which his emancipation has created would be diffused, and it is only through the actual pressure of duties and responsibilities that political judgment is steadied and clarified, and political temper sweetened. If this could be done—that is, if the migration from the South could be greatly enlarged, and directed to other States as well as Kansas—we should probably witness the complete disappearance of the colored man from politics, because no part of the country would be left in the very undesirable position of a mere critic of the doings of other parts in his behalf.

But it is none the less true that, as our correspondent says, a good deal of the continuance of the bellicose spirit is due to the permanence among religious people of what may be called the mediæval view of war. In the Middle Ages the public enemy was not simply a rival or competitor or disputant; he was a criminal person, on whom defeat was a piece of divine chastisement. The object of fighting him, too, was not simply to dispossess him of something, or to prevent his seizing something, but to make him suffer. The war against him was carried on partly in the spirit of a crusade and partly of a family feud, and no end of it was considered satisfactory which did not leave him in a state of wretchedness. In the eyes of the modern statesman and professional soldier, however, war is simply a necessary mode of settling a controversy—a rough, brutal, and unsatisfactory mode, the rancor and destructiveness of which ought to be confined within the narrowest limits possible. This view, however, is somewhat hard for men who make the cultivation of moral earnestness their first duty, and they find it all the more difficult the deeper their sense of close relation to the Almighty.

It is very difficult, too, for any man who approaches duties or responsibilities in the absolute temper which a strong sense of Divine guidance gives, to bring himself to believe that when he passed three years in anything so solemn and serious as killing people, he was simply engaged in deciding which of two ways of working out a political question should prevail. There is something shocking to such a man in admitting that his enemies were, perhaps, after all good fellows, and that as long as the question was settled, the fewer of them there were killed and the sooner we made friends with the survivors the better. The following extract from the refusal of the Rev. J. H. Acton, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to deliver an oration on Decoration Day, which curiously corroborates our correspondent's view, is clearly the utterance of one who fought as the Hebrew or mediæval soldier fought, not that he might live afterwards in peace and friendship with his enemy, but that he might get rid of him eternally. He cannot

understand his being allowed to show himself in Congress any more than a Zulu can understand the European custom of taking prisoners:

"We are still on picket. The war is not over. The distant mutter of the conflict can still be heard. We are yet to lay other treasures away in the grave, murdered on the altar of revolution. We cannot insult our comrades; over their graves, before the God of the nation, we have sworn allegiance to the cause for which they died, and stand ready for the next bugle-call. But we have never scattered flowers and never will until the right shall finally triumph, and the enemies of our common country are driven from the place of power. Let the dead sleep. We are ashamed publicly to speak of their heroism in the history of to-day. They have passed beyond the stench and corruption, the flies and the maggots, the hunger and thirst under burning Southern suns, and no longer ask aught of us. Our heart aches. It is all a huge farce. A righteous indignation consumes us. The Government is heartlessly cruel; it called them to sacrifice a thousand times more terrible than the Juggernaut, and has forgotten the purchase price. The enemies who followed them with bloodhounds now seek the life of the nation, and orate the principles of the rebellion in the Senate chamber. No! We scorn this empty offering. Turn out these rebels; tear down their flags; send traitors where they belong; and God will carry the flowers in the deft fingers of the sunshine and the rain-drop, and will weave wreaths and garlands by the agency of the winds, and will make melody by the orchestra of all nature. Until then we shall leave our harp on the willows, and continue to cry out, 'How long, O Lord! holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them?'"

Of course this way of looking at war is really utterly uncharacteristic of the American people. The way peace was made and the vanquished South was treated was perhaps the most striking illustration possible of the completeness with which the modern idea of war has taken hold of the popular mind. There is least rancor between the men who fought in the opposing armies, and not enough among any class of men to make it possible to inflict pains and penalties on anybody. But there is enough earnestness among the more religious classes to give, in combination with the memories of the war, a bellicose cast to their humane interest in the blacks, and make it easy to divide parties on the old war lines. The more thoughtful and better educated ministers are, of course, not to be placed in this category. A man who puts much mind into his religion, and who has looked back much on the long march of the race in the past, knows that after the solemn and sacred duty of fighting which every man owes to his country and kind, comes the equally solemn and sacred duty of laying aside the fighting spirit. It is no service to either God or man, and can be no service, to keep cherishing the recollection that you did a good thing at one time in blowing the heads off certain of your fellow-Christians and tearing out their stomachs with shells, or to think every time you look at the survivors that it would be a good thing if you could get a similar chance at *their* bodies. It is not in this way that religion and humanity have been most helped. They owe their greatest advances to the gladness of those who fought that fighting was over, and to their strong and often painful efforts to put aside all thoughts and all words and all passions which seemed likely to make fighting again necessary.

Considering how easily the spirit of hatred between communities is cultivated, how prone men are to it, what unnumbered woes it has inflicted on mankind, and what a terrible struggle all the intellectual and moral agencies of the world have had in subduing it, there is something almost ludicrous in the spectacle of a minister of Christ recalling his feats on the battle-field in a burst of dithyrambic passion, and encouraging people to look to more slaughter as a means of improving the moral condition of their enemies. For the fault we all find with the Southerners now is not that they are maintaining an institution we do not like, or that they are meditating a political revolution, but that they are not better men, more law-abiding, more faithful to their contracts, and kinder to the poor and dependent. There is a touch of satanic irony in the appearance of professing Christians as promoters of a desire to improve them by lacerating their bodies with deadly weapons and burning their houses.

THE LONDON THEATRES.

LONDON, May 24, 1879.

MR. MATTHEW ARNOLD, in his volume of 'Mixed Essays,' lately published, in speaking somewhere of some of the less creditable features of English civilization, alludes to the British theatre as "probably the most contemptible in Europe." The judgment is a harsh one, but he would be a bold man who, looking round him at the condition of the London stage at the present moment, should attempt to gainsay it. I have lately made a point of gathering such impressions on the subject as were easily obtainable, and a brief record of them may not be without interest. The first impression one receives in England on turning one's attention at all in this direction, is that a very large number of people are doing the same. The theatre just now is the fashion, just as "art" is the fashion and just as literature is not. The English stage has probably never been so bad as it is at present, and at the same time there probably has never been so much care about it. It sometimes seems to an observer of English customs that this interest in histrionic matters almost reaches the proportions of a mania. It pervades society—it breaks down barriers. If you go to an evening party, nothing is more probable than that all of a sudden a young lady or a young gentleman will jump up and strike an attitude and begin to recite a poem or a speech. Every pretext for this sort of exhibition is ardently cultivated, and the London world is apparently filled with stage-struck young persons whose relatives are holding them back from a dramatic career by the skirts of their garments. Plays and actors are perpetually talked about, private theatricals are incessant, and members of the dramatic profession are "received" without restriction. They appear in society, and the people of society appear on the stage; it is as if the great gate which formerly divided the theatre from the world had been lifted off its hinges. There is, at any rate, such a passing to and fro as has never before been known; the stage has become amateurish and society has become professional. There are various explanations of this state of things, of which I am far from expressing disapproval; I mention it only because, superficially, it might seem that the theatre would have drawn strength from this large development of public favor. It is part of a great general change which has come over English manners—of the confusion of many things which forty years ago were kept very distinct. The world is being steadily democratized and vulgarized, and literature and art give their testimony to the fact. The fact is better for the world perhaps, but I question greatly whether it is better for art and literature; and therefore it is that I was careful to say just now that it is only *superficially* that one might expect to see the stage elevated by becoming what is called the fashion. They are in the truth of the matter very much more in France. In France, too, the democratizing, vulgarizing movement, the confusion of kinds, is sufficiently perceptible; but the stage has still, and will probably long have, the good fortune of not becoming the fashion. It is something at once more and less than the fashion, and something more respectable and permanent, and a part of the national life. It is a need, a constant habit, enjoying no fluctuations of credit. The French esteem the theatre too much to take rash liberties with it, and they have a wholesome dread, very natural in an artistic people, of abusing the source of their highest pleasure. Recitations, readings, private theatricals, public experiments by amateurs who have fallen in love with the footlights, are very much less common in France than in England, and of course still less common in the United States. Another fact that helps these diversions to flourish in England is the immense size of society, the prevalence of country life, the existence of an enormous class of people who have nothing in the world to do. The famous "leisure class," which is the envy and admiration of so many good Americans, has certainly invented a great many expedients for getting through the time; but there still remains for this interesting section of the human race a considerable danger of being bored, and it is to escape this danger that many of the victims of leisure take refuge in playing at histrionics.

In France (as I spoke just now of France) the actor's art, like the ancient arts and trades, is still something of a "mystery"—a thing of technical secrets, of special knowledge. This kind of feeling about it is inevitably much infringed when it becomes the fashion, in the sense that I have alluded to, and certainly the evidences of training—of a school, a discipline, a body of science—are on the English stage conspicuous by their absence. Of how little the public taste misses these things or perceives the need of them, the great and continued success of Mr. Henry Irving is a striking example. I shall not here pretend to judge Mr. Irving; but I may at least say that even his most ardent ad-

mirers would probably admit that he is an altogether irregular performer, and that an artistic education has had little to do with the results that he presents to the public. I do not mean by this, of course, that he has not had plenty of practice; I mean simply that he is an actor who, in default of any help rendered him, any control offered him by the public taste, by an ideal in the public mind, has had to get himself together and keep himself together as he could. He is at present the principal "actuality" of the London stage, and his prosperity has taken a fresh start with his having at the beginning of the winter established a theatre of his own and obtained the graceful assistance of Miss Ellen Terry. I say I shall not pretend to judge Mr. Irving, because I am aware that I must in the nature of the case probably do him injustice. His starting-point is so perfectly opposed to any that I find conceivable that it would be idle to attempt to appreciate him. In the opinion of many people the basis, the prime condition, of acting is the art of finished and beautiful utterance—the art of speaking, of saying, of diction, as the French call it; and such persons find it impossible to initiate themselves into any theory of the business which leaves this out of account. Mr. Irving's theory eliminates it altogether, and there is perhaps a great deal to be said for his point of view. I must, however, leave the task of elucidating it to other hands. He began the present season with a revival of "Hamlet"—a part, one would say, offering peculiar obstacles to treatment on this system of the unimportance of giving value to the text; and now, for some weeks past, he has been playing the "Lady of Lyons" with great success. To this success Miss Ellen Terry has very considerably contributed. She is greatly the fashion at present, and she belongs properly to a period which takes a strong interest in æsthetic furniture, archaeological attire, and blue china. Miss Ellen Terry is "æsthetic"; not only her garments but her features themselves bear the stamp of the new enthusiasm. She has a charm, a great deal of a certain amateurish, angular grace, a total want of what the French call *chic*, and a countenance very happily adapted to the expression of pathetic emotion. To this last effect her voice also contributes; it has a sort of monotonous husky thickness which is extremely touching, though it gravely interferes with the modulation of many of her speeches. Miss Terry, however, to my sense, is far from having the large manner, the style and finish, of a *comédienne*. She is the most pleasing and picturesque figure upon the English stage, but the other night, as I sat watching the "Lady of Lyons," I said to myself that her charming aspect hardly availed to redeem the strange, dingy grotesqueness of that decidedly infelicitous drama.

The two best theatres in London are the Court and the Prince of Wales's, and the intelligent playgoer is supposed chiefly to concern himself with what takes place at these houses. It is certainly true that at either house you see the London stage at its best; they possess respectively the two most finished English actors with whom I am acquainted. Mr. Arthur Cecil, at the Prince of Wales's, has a ripeness and perfection of method which reminds me of the high finish of the best French acting. He is an artist in very much the same sense that Got and Coquelin are artists. The same may be said of Mr. Hare at the Court, whose touch is wonderfully light and unerring. Indeed, for a certain sort of minute, almost painter-like elaboration of a part that really suits him, Mr. Hare is very remarkable. But the merits of these two actors, and those of some of their comrades at either theatre, only serve to throw into relief the essential weakness of the whole institution—the absolute poverty of its repertory. When Matthew Arnold speaks of the "contemptible" character of the contemporary English theatre, he points of course not merely at the bad acting which is so largely found there; he alludes also to its perfect literary nudity. Why it is that in the English language of our day there is not so much even as an unsuccessful attempt at a dramatic literature—such as is so largely visible in Germany and Italy, where "original" plays, even though they be bad ones, are produced by the hundred—this is quite a question by itself, and one that it would take some space to glance at. But it is sufficiently obvious that the poverty of the modern English theatre is complete, and it is equally obvious that the theatre is all one—that the drama and the stage hold together. There can be no serious school of acting unless there is a dramatic literature to feed it; the two things act and react upon each other—they are a reciprocal inspiration and encouragement. Anything less inspiring than the borrowed wares, vulgarized and distorted in the borrowing, upon which the English stage of to-day subsists, cannot well be imagined. Coarse adaptations of French comedies, with their literary savor completely evaporated, and their form and proportions quite sacrificed to the queer obeisances they are obliged to make to that incongruous phantom of a morality which

er,
that
has
in

lie
ner
pal
esh
ea-
ry.
t I
g-
ld
he
ful
all
ny
's
be
t-
of
t-
;
"
a-
gs
e,
';
of

8

•

8
-
-
d
e
y
d
-

-
-
e
-
-
-
-

er, that has in public opinion a fresh reality. I would like to see the full impact of my country's economic situation.

of
t-
;
"
a-
gs
e,
";
f
a-
a
l.
s
e-
-
d
e
y
d
-

the Teutonic spirit. The materialism of public opinion, which is manufactured only in the interests of speculation, the dead formality of the recent issueless parliamentary debates upon proposed usury laws, the articles of the Berlin Congress, and the hard times since the war with France, especially the last seven lean years, are all due to Jewish agency and influence. Germany is already subjugated under a foreign yoke. The decomposing mission of the "absolute individualism" of the Hebrew race, who are the "moneyed Internationals" of Western Europe, will end with the helotage of its native population in a sort of occidental New Palestine. Thus, and not by a return to Jerusalem, will prophecy be fulfilled. As the Christians penetrated and at last revolutionized the pagan world, so the Jews are revolutionizing the Christian world after and in return for two thousand years of persecution and dispersion. To the advent of the pure Slavic races the author looks for ultimate deliverance from impending "Jewish Caesarism."

Another recent, scholarly and much read work* contains some pessimistic strictures on the United States. America, it is said, is not an illustration of the westward course of empire, but it presents an entirely new line of development, with new problems, new ideals, and new dangers. Our politics, moreover, is of a scarcely higher order than that of South America; party rule has become the rule of "bosses," which are compared with the "tyrants" of Greek history. Corruption, moral, social, and political, is sure to result from suddenly increased facilities for intercourse, which causes a struggle for survival among the customs, ideals, and convictions of races, localities, etc. Only an ethnically pure people can survive the influences of modern life. This we are least of all nations fitted to do. The stultifying effects of religious superstition, and the disposition to judge of the value of education solely by the advantage it gives in money-getting, and the practice of abortion, are much exaggerated and condemned. The decrease in the ratio of native births and the preponderance of female infants, it is urged, indicate a stage of national physiological decay, while the position of woman, whether emancipated and on the platform or at the head of her own household, is calculated to give a prominence and an authority to the sentimental and personal view of things most prejudicial to rational culture and to progress.

The above views are perhaps all about equally extravagant. Most of the many writers upon the subject consider the condition of the universe far less desperate. Dr. Hartsen (Catholic) and Rev. A. Knauer (Protestant) admit that the world is as depraved and miserable as any pessimist could wish, but only to argue therefrom the certainty of blessedness in a future life; while I. Volkelt, admitting the present truth of pessimism, thinks that, in the future, happiness will come to preponderate over pain, because while "experience is pessimistic, reason is optimistic in spite of experience." Dr. L. Weiss believes that pain has been in excess in the past, but that now the balance begins to incline slightly towards the side of happiness.

After turning all these dreary pages we are less able than ever to treat the problem seriously. We cannot decide whether wretchedness preponderates by a show of hands, we are told, for there are many unconscious pessimists; nor have we any test of the quality or measure of the quantity of happiness, for, if pleasures may be imaginary, so may pains. Some of the above theories concern intellectual problems of vast moment, but they do not affect the question whether happiness is to be tediously cultivated as a virtue or an art, or whether it is simply the natural and abounding "sense of life, transcending every special form of pleasure." And yet, when we find such books as we have characterized marked and dirtied by use in the public libraries, and so eagerly discussed in periodicals and in cultivated society, we are compelled to believe that the deepest and broadest of all possible philosophical problems are gradually taking shape and form; and that a new, comprehensive, and popular answer to the ultimate questions of life and destiny may before long become imperative for the preservation of moral and social order between modern civilization and lawless democracy.

Correspondence.

PURE LINE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: May I find place in your columns for brief answer to a remark in your review of my article on "Art in Engraving on Wood"—viz., that "the detail and definition of Bewick and his school seem opposed to the practice of tint-drawing which Mr. Linton recommends."

* Hellwald's 'Cultur-Geschichte,' Bd. II.

On the contrary, the drawings of the Bewick school were, I believe, without exception, tint-drawings: the details and defining lines left absolutely to the artist-engraver. My purpose in writing that article was criticism of the "new departure," and I had not space for more than a passing, and perhaps insufficient, explanation of the value of Bewick's work and the meaning of *drawing with the graver*. I may yet find opportunity of adding to what I have already said on that subject. More seems needed, if only to prevent such misuse of words as occurs in this same June number of the *Atlantic Monthly*, where the editor, reviewing the new edition of Longfellow, says that "all but two of the pictures here are executed in pure line," adding the publishers' assurance of the same character to be maintained throughout the work. If this means only that the fine-tooth comb will not be used, so far well; *pure line*, however, has an exacter meaning, which the plausible and promising reviewer may have yet to find out.

W. J. LINTON.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., June 2, 1879.

JEWISH OFFICE-HOLDERS IN GERMANY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Respecting your remark in your article in No. 727 of the *Nation*, entitled "Reaction in Germany," "It will be long before an Israelite can be minister in Germany," I beg to state that the Minister of Finance of the Grand Duchy of Baden, Mr. Ellstaedter, is a Jew. He has held the position for the last fifteen years, antedating at least seven years the "Semitic" era of German Parliamentarism.

While I admit the existence of great prejudice against the Jew in Germany, still, according to my humble opinion, the German people would gracefully submit to the infliction of at least Mr. Bamberger, should it please Jupiter Bismarck to so dispose. He may try for a year or two the Egyptian theory of seclusion, but eventually he will have to return to the "Semitic theories." He cannot suppress these theories, nor can he get rid of their propagators by the simple processes of the Middle Ages, and it may come to pass yet that he will have to choose his support among the children of Jehovah.

Most respectfully yours,

J. SCHOENHOF.

NEW YORK, June 6, 1879.

GEGENBAUR'S ANATOMY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The statement in the *Nation* of last week that Parker was ignored in Gegenbaur's 'Anatomy' was mistaken. Repeated and full references are made to him, as will be seen on pages 455, 457, and 463. Parker's contributions to our knowledge of the development of the skull are of the utmost value, and the omission of his name in such a work would have indicated a serious one-sidedness in the references, which run up to over two hundred. As an indication of the general fairness of the references in this book, and as showing the work the different countries are doing in this direction, the following comparison is made with the references in Huxley's 'Anatomy of Invertebrated Animals' (1877). The number of names in the latter amounts to one hundred and fifty:

	Germany and Austria.	Great Britain and Ireland.	France.	Russia.	Netherlands.	United States.	Scandinavia.	Italy.	Switzerland.
Huxley.....	38	21	17	6	5	5	2	3	3
Gegenbaur.....	41	19	18	4	4	3	4	3	2

This is based on the residence of the persons referred to, the numbers indicating the percentages. If the comparison were made upon the last ten years alone, the older references being discarded, the United States would be represented by a slightly greater number. X.

[Our correspondent—who, though he does not sign his name, is a well-known American comparative anatomist—has our thanks for showing the need for qualification of the statement concerning Parker. The remark referred to the "General Bibliography of Vertebrates" upon pp. 412 and 413, where his name does not occur. We had overlooked the references at the end of sections, and on page 444, in addition to those mentioned by our correspondent.

Even here, however, the great work on the 'Shoulder-girdle and Sternum' is referred to under "Sternum" only, and we look in vain for allusion to the papers on the skulls of birds (1873 and 1875), urodela (1876), sharks and skates (1876), and pig (1873), all of which were published, or widely announced as presented, before the date of the author's Preface.

As to the proportion of American references, we can only regret to believe the correctness of our correspondent's figures. But the student of vertebrate anatomy in this country will certainly be surprised at the lack of reference to Agassiz's volumes on turtles, to Wyman's 'Development of the Skate' and 'Nervous System of the Frog,' or to the anatomico-paleontological labors of Leidy, Cope, and Marsh, although fossil "birds with teeth" are mentioned. In short, we believe that for both justice and the highest usefulness the bibliography should have been either approximately complete, as in Owen's 'Vertebrates,' or confessedly rudimentary, as in Huxley's volume upon the same group.—ED. NATION.]

SOURCES OF SPANISH-AMERICAN HISTORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR : Your correspondent "A. D." speaks of Mr. Edward Everett Hale's omission of some of the sources of Spanish-American history, especially in regard to documents touching the early history of New Mexico and Arizona. With the exception of the narratives of Cabeza de Vaca and Castañeda's story of Coronado's march, and the itinerary of Father Kino, I know of little of consequence that has been published.

The object of this note is to call the attention of archæologists to a large mass of historical material that exists in Mexico. The first explorers and missionaries to New Mexico were Franciscan friars. This was also the case in Arizona, but they were there subsequently supplanted by the Jesuits. The father-house and headquarters of the "Friars Minor" was at Querétaro, in Mexico. Among the archives of these enterprising religious at that city there was, and doubtless is, a large mass of documents of the greatest interest touching the early Spanish-American history of New Mexico especially. These, with the monuments of the order, will in time pass into decay or be forgotten. It would not be difficult for an American antiquarian to procure copies of these. Nor do I think it would be expensive.

There has been no ecclesiastical record of any consequence left by the order in New Mexico. The present secular clergy of the country have never cared a straw about such things. Everything was sent back to Mexico, and there is a rich mine for the archæologist.

Your obedient servant,

LEWIS KENNON, A.M.

FORT BAYARD, NEW MEXICO, April 27, 1879.

[Mr. Kennon is correct as to the Franciscans having been the missionaries of Mexico. But Castañeda and Father Kino are not the only published works "of consequence." We can point, for instance, to Herrera, also to Gomara, Oviedo y Valdés, to the fragments of the 'Historia de la Nueva-Galicia' written by Fray Antonio Tello, published in the second volume of Sr. Icazbalceta's 'Coleccion de Documentos para la Historia de México,' and to the 'Historia de la Nueva-Galicia,' by Don Fray Matias de la Mota-Padilla.

The great convent of the Franciscans at the City of Mexico was, in September, 1856, barbarously sacked by order of the "liberal" government, and the archives could only be saved in part. The same thing had happened to the convent of the Jesuits in 1750, at that time by order of the royal government of Spain. In 1792 the following documents relating to New Mexico were gathered in the great convent "de N. S. P. S. Francisco de México" and sent to Spain, where they formed a part of the collection of Juan Bautista Muñoz: "Relacion del Nuevo-México," by Father Gerónimo de Zarate; "Restoration of New Mexico," by Diego de Vargas Zapata; "Report on New Mexico," by Fray Alonzo de Posadas; two volumes of papers on New Mexico, numbering 372 pages; several other documents on New Biscaya, Sinaloa, and Sonora. Of the collection then formed three copies were made, consisting each of thirty-two volumes. Two of these copies remained in Mexico, and one of

them is still in the General Archives, complete with the exception of the first volume. The copy which once existed at the Franciscan convent has disappeared completely, the several volumes being scattered into private hands at various times. It is doubtful, therefore, if, aside from the Spanish copy and the Mexican copy, much of importance can yet be easily found. There is no doubt, however, that vast materials are still in existence which it will be troublesome to gather. If the enterprise called the 'Biblioteca Mexicana,' edited by Señor Vigil, continues to prosper, we may yet hope for the speedy publication of much valuable material.—ED. NATION.]

PERMANENT CAUSES OF SECTIONAL DIVISION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR : I remember that the *Nation* not long since, in an article upon Southern frauds, spoke of the "humane feeling" of the North towards the negroes as being, "after all, the most persistent force in Northern society." It has been a frequent thought of mine for many years, and one that I have more than once expressed in nearly your own language, that hatred of the Southern whites is the "most reliable force in Northern society." And in passing I will call your attention to the confirmation of my view of the matter furnished by the expressions collated in your article of a month ago, entitled "Hoosier Notions of a Republican Chief Magistrate." I predicted when Mr. Hayes entered upon his policy of pacification that he would fail utterly in bringing his party over to his views, for the reason that you cannot take the animating spirit out of a body and expect it to live. There is certainly a very large section of the Republican party—and it is the section which gives vital force to the party—to which there is no more chilling thought than that of pacification. It does not believe the Southerners capable of "being good," nor does it desire any such consummation. Some of them hail the report of a Southern outrage as a "Copperhead" hailed a Southern victory during the war, and, in my opinion, would be willing—yes, anxious—to have just as many negroes murdered, every week in the year, as might be necessary to keep the North roused to the point of for ever voting the South down.

This feeling, according to my observation, has its fountain head in the churches. For, although I was born in a section of Connecticut where Democratic opinion prevailed in the churches, I have never seen anything like it elsewhere. Undoubtedly four-fifths of the members of Protestant churches are Republicans. In the Methodist, and perhaps one or two other denominations, I should say nine-tenths are Republicans. Now, if I can read the churchly and clerical mind, I should say, further, that an unwritten article of its creed, and, in these sceptical days an even more binding than any written one, is, that Southern people are sinners, and that it is the duty of good Christians so to vote as to teach them that fact. This they have uniformly done. They did it when slavery existed, and even when they held slaves themselves, and they do it now. They did it as Federalists, as Whigs, as Republicans, and will do it again under some new name whenever the time comes. The strength of their animosity is such that it hallows, in their minds, the character and words of such men as Chandler, Morton, Logan, and Grant. Who does not remember how often, in his worst days and to the very last, Methodist conferences all over the country continued to endorse Grant? The same thing frequently happened in the case of Morton. And here in Illinois such an ignoramus as Logan is a pet of the Methodist Church. Bishop Fowler (now of New York) calls him a "Titan." And is it not plain, to-day, that these men—yes, and Republicans generally—wish to remand as many Southern States as is possible to negro and carpet-bag government? Take South Carolina as the extreme case. How many Republicans are there who, in full view of the disgraces of the past, in full view of legislative halls filled with men in whose presence John Morrissey and John Logan would pass for statesmen, in full view of the millions of debt saddled upon that State by the Parkers, Kimptons, Chamberlains, *et al.*—how many are there, I say, who would not to-morrow remand that State back to the same or an equally ruinous administration under plea of regard for the negro's rights? In fact, is not that precisely what their representatives are striving for in Washington at this moment: and is not the party gaining in strength daily upon this issue? And is not the President who displaced Packard and Chamberlain steadily yielding to them? Between two sections, one striving to force the other back to such a régime as that of from 1868 to 1876 in South Carolina, and

the latter resisting, is it possible that love or harmony can exist? *Ought* it not to be, rather, a death-struggle?

This seems, of course, like a Democratic argument; but it is not intended as such. Certainly there is little enough in the figure cut by that party at present to attract any one to it. When it surrendered to the greenback idea it deliberately abdicated all claim to respect, and destroyed its promise for the future. I have already spoken of the fact that the religious if not the moral forces of the North are mainly Republican, and full of animosity to the South. The Democratic party has so far lost its own self-respect, to say nothing of that of others, that its support is hardly more a help than a hurt to any cause. Its lack of moral force, even when in the right and in the majority, is illustrated daily before our eyes. A year ago the party redistricted Ohio, and indulged in a far from flagrant gerrymander. The State had been gerrymandered by the other side for a long period, and this was a clear case of tit-for-tat, such as might have been expected; yet to read three-fourths of the papers one would suppose the Democrats had for the first time in our history perpetrated a new and most outrageous political trick. Indiana had been for fifteen years and more outrageously gerrymandered by Mr. Morton and his followers, on both State and national representation. Yet a late attempt to retaliate in a less degree was long delayed and partly failed in a Democratic legislature, simply on account of the superior hue and cry which Republicans are always able to raise before the public. We see the same thing illustrated again in the case of contested Congressional seats. If the Democrats unseat an opponent, Republicans, fresh from their long series of similar practices, with the memorable case of Senator Stockton among them, make such an uproar as drowns Democratic defence at once, and persuades the country that the Democrats are inventing new and unheard-of villanies. Again, we see it in the case of the present contest in Congress. The attempt by the Democrats to compass the repeal of acts which, when passed, were so objectionable as to divide the party passing them, and were finally forced through by the same unparliamentary means now used to repeal, is denounced as "revolutionary" and unprecedented and monstrous, and the country seems to believe it. So little moral force, so little hold upon the public, has the Democratic party, people will hardly listen to it. The presumption is always against it. To use a negative illustration, it is somewhat in the position of an inebriate who would fain reform. To be seen taking a glass of wine injures his standing more than for a usually sober man to make an open night of it with his friends. This weak, discredited Democratic party is the only important influence which binds the sections—North and South—together. Remove it, and, for one, I fail to see what would be left but two warring sections which must, sooner or later, come to blows.

Returning now to the point at which I began, I repeat that it seems to me there is, and always has been, an inveterate animosity between the two sections. It is fully reciprocated at the South. At the North it is confined to about one-half the people; but that is the most influential, ruling half. At the South the feeling is almost unanimous among the whites. We once thought, or said, that slavery was the cause of it; but we see that it was not. It existed before the Revolution. It is not now declining. Was it brought over the ocean, an inheritance from Roundheads and Cavaliers? Is it ever to come to an end; and can these two great sections remain always united as things now are? We have heard much of the clasped hands over the bloody chasm; but it has been political ruin, and in many minds a smirched reputation, even to such old anti-slavery leaders as Chase and Seward, and Sumner and Greeley, and Adams and Trumbull, with many others who have attempted the feat.

For one, when I think about it all, I have my doubts as to the future. I query if the war was a finality. I even speculate as to whether the year 1861 will witness North and South a united nation. To speak seriously of a new civil war like the last is to entertain a terrible thought. Yet "the new rebellion" is daily dinned in our ears by vile demagogues who actually seem to try to provoke it. And I do not doubt there are thousands of shouting "loyalists" who positively desire it at the same moment they assure us it has already begun. Yet I think it may be safely doubted whether, even if assured of success, the North would be willing to enter upon such a task again. One such four years' test in a century is enough for any people.

Contemplation of such possibilities will perhaps raise the question whether our greatest danger lies in the semi-religious, sectional prejudices of Republican pietists, or in the economic ignorance of the Democratic rag, tag and bobtail. A study of history sheds a deal of light upon such a question.

Notes.

HENRY HOLT & CO. will shortly add to their Leisure-Hour Series 'Maid, Wife, or Widow?' by Mrs. Alexander, and 'Delicia,' by the author of 'Miss Molly.' They announce that the important work on Yale College, in two volumes 4to, illustrated, now ready, will not be sold through the trade. We were in error in saying last week that their edition of Symonds's 'Renaissance' was printed from the English plates, the fact being, as we are informed, that the type was set and plates made in this country expressly for the edition. Our remark will, perhaps, be allowed to pass for a compliment.—J. B. Lippincott & Co. have in press 'Bodines; or, Camping on the Lyeoming,' a practical guide to "camping out," by Dr. T. S. Up de Graff; and 'Great Authors of all Ages,' a selection of prose extracts by S. Austin Allibone.—R. Worthington publishes immediately a translation of the 'Souvenirs of Madame Le Brun,' the beautiful and accomplished artist whose long and happy life was nearly equally divided between the last century and the present. Her portrait will adorn the volume.—The notable features of the Supplement to Harvard College Library Bulletin No. 12 are a continuation of the Calendar of the Lee MSS., and conclusions of the catalogue of the Sumner Collection, of the bibliographical list of the Floras of Different Countries, and of the list of accessible scientific apparatus in our colleges, etc. The novelties are a list of the early editions of Spenser's poems; and Halliwelliana (by Mr. Winsor), brought down to 1851.—We have received from A. C. Armstrong & Son Part III. (Lenoir-Robbie) of the American Catalogue, the completion of the first volume of which is confidently expected within the next four months. It is unnecessary to repeat the praise which this admirable enterprise elicits at each new stage of its progress; but it is well to remind the general purchaser how far the catalogue is from being confined to original American works. The admirers of Moore, for instance, will find recorded here a great choice of editions, of which some are only nominally American.—We learn from the *Academy* that C. Kegan Paul & Co. have in preparation 'John Keats: a Study,' by Mrs. Owen; and from the same journal that an ineffectual attempt was made to procure a Civil-List pension for Keats's only sister, Mme. Fanny Keats de Llanos. An award of £150, however, having been made from the Queen's Bounty Fund, the memorialists have treated it as the nucleus of an adequate fund, and, having subscribed themselves, invite co-operation. Mr. W. M. Rossetti, 56 Euston Square, London, N. W., is of the committee to receive and acknowledge subscriptions.—*Polybiblion* for May has notices of several recent French works relating to this country: the Comte Louis de Turenne's 'Quatorze mois dans l'Amérique du Nord,' which takes an unfavorable view of our condition; Christophe Allard's 'Promenade au Canada et aux États-Unis,' too much given, we are told, "à l'admiration banale des voyageurs naïfs devant les Humbugs Yankees"; and 'Le Fondateur des Missions du Missouri-Central,' the Jesuit father Hélias d'Huddeghem, namely, who came to this country in 1833. *Polybiblion* also notices the publication by Didot of Montesquieu's 'Grandeur et Décadence des Romains,' with the hitherto unpublished notes of Frederic II., after the original captured at Potsdam by Napoleon. In the "Variétés" the bibliographical notes on the royal flight to Varennes in June, 1791, are concluded; and in the "Questions" a well-known scholar announces that he has encountered the word *philologie* in an unpublished letter of Joseph Scaliger's of 1577—a much earlier reference than Littré's, who quotes from Rollin's 'Ancient History.'—The annual meeting of the National Education Association will be held at Philadelphia on the last three days of July, and in connection with it the Spelling-Reform Association will also hold a session under the presidency of Prof. March, July 29 and 30. Addresses on the condition of the reform in America, by Prof. March, and in Germany and Europe by Prof. Brandt, are promised.—The twenty-eighth annual meeting of the Association for the Advancement of Science will be held at Saratoga in August, commencing August 27. Several geologic excursions, on Lakes George and Champlain, are contemplated. The headquarters of the Association will be at the United States Hotel.—J. W. Bouton announces that he has made arrangements for furnishing the *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* to American subscribers at the yearly rate of fifteen dollars, postage included, along with the weekly *Chronique des Arts*. Mr. Bouton is also the agent of the *Portfolio* and of *L'Art*.

—Dr. Elliott Cues's Bibliographical Appendix to his 'Birds of the Colorado Valley,' which we lately reviewed, has proved the occasion of one of the highest compliments paid of recent years to American science. A memorial has been addressed to him, signed by Professor Flower, Huxley,

Darwin, Mivart, Wallace, Gould, Sclater, Guenther, Newton, and numerous other eminent English zoologists, declaring his special fitness to undertake a complete Bibliography of Ornithology, and urging the importance—the indispensableness, in fact—of his visiting the older European libraries in order, for the non-American portion, to consult every work mentioned at first hand. They express the hope that the same official liberality which has permitted Dr. Coues to remain in Washington for the prosecution of his bibliographical labors, will grant him leave of absence and provide the means for carrying out the wishes of the memorialists; and they promise him a warm welcome to England and every assistance in their power. Such a call ought to be irresistible, and we have every reason to believe that it will be heeded.

—We are requested to state that the family of the late William Lloyd Garrison desire the loan, with the privilege of copying, of such of his private letters as have a *biographical* importance, especially for the early years of his life. These letters will be carefully returned according to the instructions of the lender. They may be sent to Mr. Francis J. Garrison, care of Houghton, Osgood & Co., Boston.

—Director James T. Gardner's Report for 1878 of the New York State Survey recalls afresh the suggestive comparison between the accurate survey of the Moon's surface and what has hitherto passed for the survey of the first State in the Union. Two sheets accompany the report, embracing the interior belt from Albany to Rochester, on which the labors of the Survey have been chiefly bestowed. On these are set down only those "points, boundaries, and topographical features whose geographical positions are precisely known by trigonometrical measurement." So astonishingly few are these that, the United States Survey of the Lakes and the United States Coast Survey being excluded, the work of Mr. Gardner and his assistants during the past three years is all that saves the map from being a *tabula rasa*. But let us come down to particulars:

"The measurements embrace an area of about two thousand square miles in one of the most wealthy and populous parts of the State, containing two important cities and nearly two hundred villages and hamlets; yet every one of these towns is misplaced, from one to two miles, on all existing maps of the State, no trigonometrical determinations of latitude and longitude having ever before been made in the region."

"In the State Engineer and Surveyor's office there is no record of the true bearing and length of the lines which bound so important a county as Onondaga. After a careful search among the original notes of the lot surveys, I am unable to ascertain the area of this county within ten thousand acres."

"We have no reliable data by which to draw the course of even such rivers as the upper Hudson, the Mohawk, the Delaware, the Susquehanna, the Chemung, the Clyde, Seneca, or Oswego; nor do we know where to trace the shore-lines of Lake George, Oneida Lake, or the beautiful lakes Skaneateles, Owasco, Cayuga, Seneca, Crooked, or Canandaigua."

"The positions of such important places as Utica, Rome, Binghamton, Owego, Elmira, Canandaigua, and hundreds of other towns and villages, are equally undetermined in latitude and longitude, and cannot therefore be placed upon the map correctly."

"Our map shows that the distance from Albany to Auburn is a mile and a half less than given by French [1860]; that the breadth of the State from Pennsylvania to Lake Ontario is three-quarters of a mile broader; and that the spot where French has placed the city of Oswego is really covered by the lake. No one can tell the endless errors, in minor detail, of a chart whose misplacements are counted by miles at the most important cities, and which puts the warehouses of Oswego in five fathoms of water. Yet such is to-day the best map of the State of New York."

In view of these facts, it is shameful that the work of the Survey has been retarded by delay in making the modest annual appropriation of \$15,000, so that the season of field-work has been shortened, and even some economies prevented. Mr. Gardner cannot forbear to express his delight in the revelations each season of the "grandeur, beauty, and variety of the landscapes" observed in the prosecution of the work:

"Ideas of the aspects of the State derived from maps have, in my own case, proved to be so false and vague that I find in this survey the attractive novelty of exploring an unknown region. Colorado was not a greater surprise to me than has been the structure of my native State. . . . The configuration of a part of Central New York is as unique and as unknown to science as that of any part of the Rocky Mountains."

—The most entertaining papers in the Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society for 1878, which have not been noticed by us before when published in pamphlet form, are the "Narrative of Jolley Allen," written by himself, and "Tutor Flynt's Journey to Portsmouth," written by his companion and driver, David Sewall, then an undergraduate in the class of John Adams, for whom this account seems to have

been written in the author's old age. Jolley Allen was a noted Boston Tory; his nervous and ungrammatical style shows the querulous old man with admirable distinctness, and, to believe his own tale, he certainly was maltreated by the Americans as well as by fortune, from the time when the Boston Committee called on him to see where he bought his tea until he got safely on board the British fleet at New York. It would be a long story to tell how he put to sea with wife, children, and household goods in a ship whose captain and crew had never been on salt water for a week, and how the patriots of Cape Cod sacked his vessel, the General Court at Watertown completed his ruin, while the crowd at the court-house threatened him with unheard-of punishments, and the mobs of Shrewsbury marched him about in terror of his life; he lost his property, his wife, and eldest son, but he preserved his loyalty. The article deserves to be read as a lively sketch of one side of the Revolution which is not much dwelt on by American writers, and it is full of humorous incidents and human nature. Tutor Flynt's journey took place in 1754, when that somewhat famous bachelor was nearly eighty; it was made with a single horse and "chair," and along the route the travellers availed themselves of the hospitality of the clergy who had been educated at the college, and of whose family and social life we have here pleasant glimpses. Tutor Flynt is amusingly portrayed as a social man, given to much punch and the ladies' society, not above a questionable joke from the Scriptures when in his cups, and not too severe in the discipline of his classes if his own anecdotes are to be believed. Besides these articles there are some interesting letters of Andrew Eliot describing the days of the siege in Boston, a letter of Paul Revere describing his famous ride, Colonel Hutchinson's Orderly-Book, and memoirs of the Hon. B. R. Curtis, George Bemis, Hon. James Savage, and the historian Motley. There is a fine portrait of Motley, and the usual full index. The entire volume is one of extraordinary interest.

—Miss Ada Cavendish, like many other successful English actors and actresses of the present day, is asserted to have made her first entrance into theatrical life through the hospitable portals of burlesque. If true, this may almost be said to create a presumption in her favor, as so many instances at once recur to the mind of the theatre-goer of remarkable translations from the world of burlesque to that of tragedy and comedy. In fact, from a certain (perhaps heterodox) point of view, burlesque affords, in the present condition of the English stage, not a bad school of acting for beginners. As there are no traditions or preconceptions connected with it, no one can make a success in it without having some positive theatrical talent; and if this talent be of any magnitude, it is sure to push its possessor into better and more ambitious attempts. With regard to Miss Cavendish, however, we do not feel sure after seeing her in "As You Like It" whether Shaksperian comedy is exactly the kind of acting that her reputed success in burlesque qualified her for. The part of *Rosalind* is one which fires the ambition of all young actresses, as that of *Hamlet* does all young actors; we doubt if, on the whole, *Rosalind* is not the more difficult of the two parts to make a hit in. Mr. Lewes, in his clever essays on the stage, says somewhere that he never saw an altogether bad *Hamlet*; the play itself possessing such a profound and sombre interest and being so full of theatrical merits that it carries along any decently good actor, so as to make him seem for the time almost a distinguished tragedian. But with a light and fanciful comedy such as "As You Like It" there is no middle ground between success and failure. *Rosalind* is either before you in flesh and blood, or she is not there at all; and we do not mean to deny Miss Cavendish a great deal of ability as an actress if we say that she never once puts *Rosalind* before us. The part, difficult as it is, on account of the amount of fancy, grace, and vivacity required of the actor, is made still more out of ordinary reach by the extreme fastidiousness and prudishness of a modern audience. *Rosalind*, this erratic princess who takes to the life of an outlaw in man's attire, is not the product of a fastidious period, and is not herself a fastidious person. She says many things and listens to many more, without thinking any harm, which no well-conducted daughter of a modern matron who formed one of such an audience as is brought together by a Shaksperian revival would dream of saying or listening to; and yet she is throughout a most charming woman. To make her witty, vivacious, graceful, mischievous, and fascinating; to avoid making what she does and says jar upon the taste of a sensitive audience; this is the task which any one undertakes who plays the part of *Rosalind*. Miss Cavendish does not, to our mind, succeed. She is heavy when she attempts vivacity, phlegmatic when she should be sensitive, and masculine when she ought to be feminine. Sometimes she faintly suggested *Rosalind*, but rarely more.

There is no originality in her conception of the part, except possibly in the scene where she receives the news of *Orlando's* wound, in which, for some reason best known to herself, she listens to the announcement with complete indifference, sitting down to hear all about it, and finally *getting up* to faint, at her cue. All this was quite unintelligible to us, though Miss Cavendish no doubt has some theory to base it on. The rest of the performance was only fair; Mr. Wheelock, who is an excellent actor in many parts, failing as *Orlando*, while Mr. Robinson made *Jaques* a very melancholy person. *Jaques*, however, has hardly ever been well done by anybody, and for a very good reason: that he is a character thrust into the play, without relation to the other parts, in order that he may make speeches. He has nothing to do with the action, and if the part had never been written, "As You Like It" would hardly have been worse, while the reputation of many very competent actors would have escaped a very trying ordeal. Mr. Gilbert took the part of *Adam*, which he of course performed creditably, though he is better as the "old man" of modern than of Shaksperian comedy. Mr. Becket as *Touchstone* and Miss Germon as *Audrey* were both capital.

—If Miss Cavendish makes a failure of *Rosalind*, we hardly know how to describe what she makes of *Miss Gwilt*. The character of Mr. Wilkie Collins's governess—perpetually vacillating between villainy and virtue; exulting in one moment over the "splendid wickedness" of a fraudulent personation of the widow of *Allan Armadale*, and racked the next with remorse for her crime; plotting with real gusto a peculiarly devilish murder with her rascally old friend the Doctor, and securing the forgiveness of her husband by her not unnatural willingness to bring her career to an abrupt termination on finding that it is his life she has been attempting to take instead of his friend's—this strange and unreal mixture of good and bad passions seems even more strange and unreal on the stage than in the pages of Wilkie Collins's grotesque but interesting novel. Miss Cavendish certainly makes some strong points with it. When, at the crisis of her fate, certain that her husband knows her guilty secret and that she is lost, she falls nerveless and unresisting into the hands of the tempter who makes her his tool, and obeys him in a sort of evil trance, in which we seem to see a person who has suddenly but finally parted company with her conscience, the acting of Miss Cavendish struck us as having a certain originality and vigor. Her scornful contempt of her betrayer, *Captain Manuel*, was also very good, and the applause of the audience at many of these "points" shows unmistakably that she has touched some sympathetic chords. But the "points" are the whole of the performance. In the intervals between them she is simply an ordinary actress (with a fine voice) going through her part in a commonplace manner. Indeed, if it were not for the other parts the play would be irredeemably dull. As a matter of fact, the other parts were unusually well done; Mr. Hardenbergh as *Captain Manuel*, Mr. Weaver as *Doctor Downward*, Miss Boniface as *Miss Milroy*, Mr. Lee as *Armadale*, and Mr. Wheelock as *Midwinter*, all acting with great evenness and spirit.

—The three lectures upon Etching by Mr. Seymour Haden, at the Royal Institution, London, just concluded, were a surprise to a very mixed auditory, in which the scientific rather than the professional element prevailed. Mr. Haden repeated and dwelt on the old dictum that the poet with the pencil as with the pen is born and not made. He insisted that the artist should preserve "first conceptions." He was very earnest, and almost exhausted all there was to be said on the subject, in urging that etching should be restored to its proper place in art; and he was at much pains to lay down the marked difference between the art of Engraving and the art of Etching, contrasting the burin and the etcher's needle. From his own portfolio he brought fine work in etching by Rembrandt, Claude, Vandyke, and Turner. The whole process was then described and illustrated, much to the delight of the audience, for the lecturer etched a plate and had it printed before them. In short, the lectures were not only of the highest order, but were a great success, and are to be repeated this fall in some of the principal towns in the North of England. We may add here an illustration of Mr. Haden's extreme conscientiousness in all that he has to do with his favorite pursuit. Only a few months ago two of his etchings were included in the sales at the Hôtel Drouot, and were secured, after a severe competition, running the price up to three or four times their ordinary price, by a gentleman who, having obtained them on the spot from the auctioneer, deliberately tore one of them to pieces. The purchaser represented Mr. Haden, and by his instruction had destroyed the print as one too inferior to be preserved, and not marked so as to certify that it had passed Mr. Haden's review and was deserving a place among a collector's treasures.

—The formal reception of M. Henri Martin as the successor of M. Thiers by the French Academy met with an unexpected obstacle, owing to the fact that M. Émile Ollivier chanced to be the "receiver" on behalf of that body. To begin with, M. Martin had introduced into his eulogy of his predecessor a description of the famous session in which Thiers denounced, amid the abuse of the Bonapartists, the folly of declaring war against Prussia, as the Empire was on the eve of doing. This led, of course, to a counter-recital on the part of M. Ollivier, and, to avoid a disagreeable scene, M. Martin consented to omit the obnoxious passage, when, of course, M. Ollivier would have to make a corresponding retrenchment. The latter, however, had gone somewhat further in his defence of himself, as it may truthfully be called, and attacked M. Thiers's conduct under the circumstances as not being that of a patriot or a Frenchman. He ought, declared M. Ollivier, to have stood by the Empire as did General Changarnier, the type of the perfect patriot and true Frenchman. The commotion which such sentiments would produce in the reception audience was only too plainly to be foreseen, and when the speaker refused to modify so much as a line of what he had written, the committee to whom the two discourses were referred, consisting of men like Jules Simon, Dufaure, Mignet, Legouvé, Sardou, decided by 7 to 1 to refer the matter back to the Academy, which, as the Cable reports, by 13 to 12 decided to replace M. Ollivier with M. Xavier Marmier. So the reception, which had been set down for May 29, will have to be postponed again.

—A Mr. Albert Last has published a pamphlet on 'Die Schäden in der literarischen Production Deutschlands,' in which are to be found some interesting statistics of the German book-trade. The alleged bad condition of the same he accounts for on the ground of over-production. At the beginning of the century there were in Germany (including German Austria) 250 bookshops; in 1820 there were 500; to-day there are 5,200. In the year 1851 there were published 8,000 volumes; 1870, 10,000; 1874, 12,070; 1876, 13,356; 1878, 13,912. In England, in the last-named year, there appeared but 5,314 works. The worst of this over-production is that much more time is required for a clever writer to make himself known than would otherwise be the case. Spielhagen's reputation, for instance, was so long in establishing itself that before the publication of 'Problematische Naturen' one of his books was actually sold as waste-paper.

—The value of the older commentators on the 'Divine Comedy' for the history of Florence and Italy during the thirteenth and part of the fourteenth centuries has long been appreciated. Dr. C. Hegel has recently instituted a careful comparison between them, and published the result in a work entitled 'Ueber den historischen Werth der älteren Dante-Commentare' (Leipzig. 1878. 8vo, pp. 115). He passes in review some fifteen works from the 'Chiose anonime,' published by Selmi in 1865, and probably written during the lifetime of Dante, to the comment of Vellutello, published in 1544. The most valuable, according to the author, are the comments of Jacopo della Lana, Benvenuto da Imola, and the so-called *ottimo* (especially as to Florentine history)—the second named of course in the original Latin version. Dr. Hegel has not seen Professor C. E. Norton's review of Tamburini's Italian translation, or he would have warned students against it. He himself generally cites the extracts printed by Muratori, 'Antiquitates italicæ,' i. p. 1034-1:98. Two commentators who have heretofore enjoyed a high reputation for historical value, Francesco da Buti and the *Anonimo fiorentino*, are pronounced of little worth. Dr. Hegel gives where possible the sources of the various comments, and reveals an immense amount of borrowing by one from the other. In the appendix he adduces what appears to him an additional proof of the genuineness of the chronicle of Dino Compagni. The *Anonimo fiorentino* mentioned above, and probably of the beginning of the fifteenth century, in several passages relates historical events in almost the same words used by Dino, whose opponents see in this another proof of his falseness, believing that the writer of the chronicle, whoever he was, borrowed part of his material from the *Anonimo*. Hegel, however, shows that the *Anonimo*, like the other commentators, drew largely on Villani's 'Istorie fiorentine,' and uses that material in the same manner as he employs the passages contained in Dino, sometimes beginning with Villani and finishing out his narration with Dino. Hence he concludes that the *Anonimo* borrowed from Dino or from Dino's source. An undoubted citation from Dino's chronicle as early as the beginning of the fifteenth century would do much to confirm its authenticity. The author confesses, however, "that the chronicle as a whole in its contents and form is a problem hard to solve, whichever side one takes in the question."

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL ON THE EASTERN QUESTION.*

THE Eastern Question—which, broadly stated, is the question whether the Turks shall be allowed to remain in Europe—sprang into existence when the Turks crossed the Dardanelles in 1356; after more than five centuries, its final settlement seems now to be approaching with the return of the Turks to Asia during the latter part of this century or the beginning of the next. It is more than three hundred years since the tide of Turkish conquest began to ebb, but it is only within the last fifty or sixty years that it has been apparent that the Ottoman Empire was crumbling to pieces from the vices and corruption into which its ruling class had fallen. The jealousies of the different nations interested in the fate of the Turk have, however, prevented any agreement as to the manner in which he shall be succeeded, and so he has been allowed to remain a chronic source of disturbance to the peace of Europe. At intervals of about a generation the Eastern Question has passed from the chronic to the acute stage; and it is the diplomatic history of the latest of these acute periods, now barely terminated, which the Duke of Argyll traces in detail in the two volumes before us.

As a member of the Cabinet which carried on the Crimean War and framed the Treaty of Paris, the Duke begins his book with an elaborate argument to explain the meaning of the "independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire," which was the fundamental idea of that Treaty. He contends that "dependence and independence are relative terms," and that no nation whose independence must be guaranteed by others is in reality independent at all, in the sense in which great nations are independent; that the meaning of these words must be gathered from the circumstances under which they were framed—viz., at the end of a war waged by the Western Powers to establish the principle "that the fate of Turkey was to be a matter of European and not only of Russian concern"; and therefore that the words simply mean that the affairs of Turkey in its downfall shall be considered and regulated by Europe collectively, and not by Russia acting alone.

This explanation is interesting, considering the source from which it comes: for when, on the occurrence of the Bulgarian massacres in 1876, the united voice of Christendom cried out that such damnable outrages should cease—with the destruction of the government which permitted them, if no other means were efficacious—the English Cabinet took the ground that express treaty stipulations (as well as considerations of policy) prevented them from exercising any pressure upon the Turks stronger than that of moral suasion and advice. The Duke of Argyll now endeavors to show that this construction of the Treaty was a false one, but his argument is simply that the words must be taken in a Pickwickian sense. When the long period of Turkish misgovernment culminated in the massacres of 1876, it was perfectly competent for England to denounce the Turks as having persistently and flagrantly violated the engagements which they made in the Treaty of Paris, to demand sufficient guarantees for the protection and good government of the Christians, and to support its demands by force—the only argument which the Turks appreciate. Such a course would have prevented the war between Russia and Turkey, and would probably have led to the supplanting of Turkish authority in many districts by European commissions; but it would have torn up the Treaty of Paris, as Russia desired. To pretend that while such measures were being taken the independence of the Ottoman Empire was being respected, is a contradiction in terms. In fact, the two cardinal features of the Treaty of Paris—viz., the admission of the Turks into the European concert, and the guarantee of the independence and integrity of their empire—were two as false and fatal steps in the settlement of the Eastern Question as any which have been made by England's Cabinet during the recent war.

Having attempted to elucidate the Treaty of Paris, the Duke then proceeds to recapitulate the action of Turkey during the succeeding twenty years; it is the old tale of horrible misgovernment and perversion of justice with which every one who reads is familiar. He then comes to the Bosnian insurrection, the Andrassy Note, the Berlin Memorandum, the Bulgarian massacres, the Constantinople Conference, the London Protocol, and finally the declaration of war. Throughout all these negotiations the Duke considers the policy of the English Cabinet to have been weak, shiftless, and vacillating, while that of Russia he regards as manly and upright, justified by the highest considerations of duty and policy, and by the terms of existing treaties.

The Duke of Argyll's argument, briefly stated, is that the fate of

Turkey must be decided by Europe collectively, and not by Russia alone in her own interests. To this there is probably not a dissenting voice in all England: but the Duke holds that the surest way to counteract Russia in any ambitious schemes she may have for her own aggrandizement is for England to compel the Turks, by force if necessary, to put an end to her misgovernment, for England to make the cause of the Christians her own, and not throw them into the arms of Russia for lack of any one else to espouse their cause. The Tories, under the lead of Beaconsfield and Salisbury, hold, on the contrary, that the only barrier to Russia's advance lies in strengthening the Sultan, overlooking as much as possible, in view of greater considerations, the faults of his government, and hindering and thwarting Russia in every way. The whole of the Tory party, however, could not be brought to the point of supporting these views by war, and the only result, in the Duke's opinion, of the halting policy actually followed has been to strengthen Russian influence in the East instead of diminishing it, and to cause the Christians throughout Turkey to look upon Russia as their only deliverer and upon England as the firmest friend of their hated oppressors; while, since Russia was allowed to crush Turkey without armed interference by England, the influence of the latter Power over the millions of her Mohammedan subjects has been just as much diminished as if she had openly taken up the cause of the Christians.

The Duke is very severe upon the Cabinet for their double dealing and inconsistency in the secret agreements which they made before entering the Berlin Congress, and he sums up the result of that Congress and its Treaty as it is already viewed by a large party of the Tories themselves—viz., that every material advantage which Russia gained by the war was confirmed to her by the Treaty, while the separation of the Bulgarians by a "strategic frontier" of no strategic value into two portions, of which one should be free and the other subject to the Porte, has only laid the seeds of future trouble and wars.

The Duke of Argyll very properly treats the present war in Afghanistan as only "the Afghan part of the Eastern Question." His views on this subject are again interesting from the fact that he was Secretary of State for India in Mr. Gladstone's cabinet from 1869 to 1874. He recites at great length the relations existing between the Indian Government and Afghanistan from the first Afghan war in 1841 to the commencement of hostilities last November, endeavoring to show that the uniform policy of all the Indian governments up to the second year of Lord Salisbury's installation as Secretary for India and the inauguration of the "Imperial policy," had been to treat the ruler of Afghanistan with kindness but with firmness; to offer him substantial guarantees for his defence in case he was attacked by Russia, to abstain from interfering in his dynastic quarrels, to respect his independence so long as he remained friendly, and to avoid injuring his pride by forcing British resident agents upon him. This policy, the Duke maintains, has been wholly overthrown by Lord Salisbury, and especially since Lord Lytton has been Viceroy; and the course pursued towards the Amir has been that of bullying him into receiving British agents and forcing him into a position of hostility; and in so doing the British Government

"has paltered with the force of existing treaties; it has repudiated solemn pledges; it has repeated over and over again insincere professions; and it has prepared new treaties full of 'tricky saving clauses.' Finally, it has visited on a weak and unoffending native sovereign in Asia the natural and necessary consequences of its own incoherent action in Europe. The policy which brought the Russian army to the gates of Constantinople is the same policy which brought the Russian mission to Cabul."

To American readers the Afghan question is only of interest in its bearing upon the settlement of the Eastern Question, which involves the peace of all Europe and thus affects the whole civilized world. The unfortunate ruler of Afghanistan merely stands between two great Powers who are liable to come to blows, and he is in danger of being pulverized in their contest. When Russia thought that England was preparing to wage war upon her after the Treaty of San Stefano, she made preparations to strike England in India, and for this purpose began to negotiate with Afghanistan to secure the passage of her troops through that country. When the Treaty of Berlin removed the source of danger, Russia withdrew. England then made demands upon the Amir which he declined to accede to, and England proceeded to enforce them. Russia has not thought it necessary to interfere against these demands; and so the Amir suffers the consequences of his unfortunate situation.

The Duke's long and somewhat heavy narrative is valuable from the fact that it is drawn almost wholly from the Blue-Books published by Parliament, to which reference by volume and page is made in every

* The Eastern Question, from the Treaty of Paris, 1856, to the Treaty of Berlin, 1878, and to the Second Afghan War. By the Duke of Argyll. 2 vols. 12mo, pp. 426 and 520. London: Strahan & Co. 1879.

case; and it thus forms a sort of hand-book of ready reference to the diplomatic proceedings during the last four years affecting the subject of which it treats.

HAGEMAN'S PRINCETON.*

LOCAL chronicles are always welcome as fresh material for broader and more ambitious history, and they have a human interest as far as they repeat and fix the details of human life. In this instance a village and villagers whose influence has been out of all proportion to the population supply the theme. Princeton's fame is a threefold union of martial, political, and educational renown. It embraces the lustre of brilliant victory; the credit of notably shaping the destiny of the young nation, and the distinction belonging to a time-honored seat of learning. The name, whose special significance is now forgotten, was bestowed in 1724, nearly thirty years after a Quaker colony bought and settled on large tracts of land on the neighboring water-course of Stony Brook. To those Friends, whose meeting-house and family names remain, but whose peculiar faith has now nearly faded out there, much of the prosperity of Princeton is due; and its annals are completely free from the injustice and bloodshed of Indian wars that stain so many pages of pioneer history. An accident of topography made it a Revolutionary battle-field, whose celebrity is due to the critical state of the country relieved by an exceptional victory. But nearly all of its higher and more lasting fame followed the thoughtful liberality of its citizens which in 1752 fixed there the infant college. For the college infused patriotism as well as learning, hence Princeton's Revolutionary and civic record. The college opened the way for the seminary, hence its theological reputation. The college atmosphere was that of letters and repose, hence its charming society. The dominating idea, the promotion of piety and sound learning, gave the college a succession of distinguished presidents, culminating at the Revolution in Witherspoon, a statesman as well as a divine. Following liberal influences, Princeton supplied seven members to the Provincial Congress, one of whom reported June, 1776, the State constitution that remained in force till 1844, and she gave two illustrious signers to the Declaration of Independence, and in all five members to the Continental Congress. The State government was organized there August, 1776, the village remained its seat till late in 1778, and there the Council of Safety held frequent sessions. In fact, all through the Revolution Princeton was a military and political focus, until in 1783 Congress itself retired thither from the menacing Pennsylvania soldiery at Philadelphia. During that five months' session the definite announcement of peace was received and the Continental army was disbanded by proclamation, and it was from Princeton that Washington published his farewell orders.

A chair of divinity was early established in the college, and the successive presidents prepared many candidates for the Presbyterian ministry. Princeton thus became the natural seat of the great theological seminary of the Presbyterian Church, founded in 1811. Wise and accomplished teachers have spread its fame far beyond denominational bounds, and, however opinions may differ as to its special tenets, the vigor of thought and depth of learning of Princeton theology have never been questioned.

The distinctive British stock of Princeton received a foreign graft from a mixed Protestant and Catholic colony of Gallic refugees that settled on its northern border in 1795. Of their names, now nearly all mere memories, Peter Anthony Malou's, whose career was full of romantic contrasts, was the most notable. But the constant exercise of a liberal but delicate charity by one of their direct descendants keeps, and will long keep, their warm and generous blood in grateful remembrance. Another refugee about the same period, but of different type, was Wolfe Tone, whose American residence was Princeton, whither his widow returned after his death.

As would be expected from its antecedents, a continuous succession of names eminent for secular and clerical erudition, and for high social and political place, and personal wealth and private and organized benevolence, have adorned the village. Besides its Revolutionary characters and its special scholars it has furnished at least two members to the early Federal House, five to the United States Senate, and diplomats, judges, and two famous sailors to the public service. It was foremost in the organization of Colonization, Bible, Temperance, and local benevolent schemes, conspicuous and characteristic among which is the existing disinterested charitable institution to "assist indigent youth in obtaining a liberal and Christian education without regard or reference to their future profession, occupation, or employment." The New Jersey system of

common schools found its earliest and most ardent supporters there, and there originated the State Agricultural Society. Princeton families have been more constantly represented in the army than is usual in a Northern village, but her most distinguished warriors were Commodores Bainbridge and Stockton, both natives, whose fame is public history. Stockton's naval career covered a wide range, and included as an episode the acquisition of the territory of Liberia for the Colonization Society, and was crowned in the conquest of California. His prompt appreciation of Ericsson's genius, and his controlling influence in transferring that engineer to this country, which is one of his greatest merits, the author fails to notice; nor does he seem fully to realize that the building of the *Princeton* man-of-war, the embodiment of Ericsson's science and Stockton's energy, was a pivotal point in the history of naval construction.

The features distinguishing Princeton from other country towns are those that make its actual history so attractive, but for their complete representation they require industrious research, enthusiasm in the subject, and vivacity of style. In this work the author has presented the salient points and has noted much of the minutiae. The general outline of the early settlement is clear; the battle is concisely and intelligently described; the steps leading to the establishment of the college and of the seminary are well recited, and the careers of those institutions are fairly followed up; and the history of the First Presbyterian Church is admirable. The record as a whole is trustworthy, and it is accurate except as to a few minor particulars. For instance, to Dr. Breckinridge is given credit belonging to Dr. Maclean in establishing the Witherspoon Street church; from the notice of Betsey Stockton, a most estimable colored woman, is omitted the impressive fact that she taught the first school opened for the common people on the Sandwich Islands; Bishop Hare, of the Episcopal Church, is properly to be included among the prominent natives; the names Van Arsdale and Van Polanen are misspelled; a very curious transposition to the mercantile marine is made of a gentleman whose title of captain was derived from active military service, and whose walk and conversation in no respect savored of the sea. These and similar errors and omissions local criticism will probably correct against a second edition.

But, disregarding these minor oversights, there are positive transgressions that seem hardly possible of perpetration by the resident of a college town. Witness this: "This character of the climate of the State is confirmed by its proximity to the thirty-eighth parallel of north latitude, which is the point of the average temperature of the earth, and where the Great Pyramid of Egypt is located, the orientation there being more accurate than in any other observatory" (i. p. 13). Apart from the error of eight degrees of latitude in the position of the pyramid, does it seem possible to frame a more inexact, grotesque, and inconsequential sentence? So (i. p. 3) reference is made to "Hassler's Triangle-post" in such a way as to imply that it was "a height sometimes used to convey, by signal, intelligence . . . before the days of railroads and electric telegraphs." This obvious confusion of the Coast Survey "triangulation point," fixed on Mt. Rose by Mr. Hassler, with the old semaphore line that also had a station on Rocky Hill, is unworthy a local historian. Such eccentricities of statement are, however, less numerous than those of style or expression. For instance, in the preface Princeton is spoken of as possessing a "notoriety" which most of her lovers would prefer to call renown or fame, and then, curiously or carelessly, "notorious" is the somewhat mild epithet applied (i. p. 167) to the disorderly Pennsylvania soldiers of 1783. "The tidal wave of prosperity had *flown in*" (ii. p. 151); "It was he . . . assisted some by . . . who accepted" (i. p. 32); "what a mighty *stride it has taken upward and onward* since President McCosh has *taken the helm*" (ii. p. 296); and, with a persistence that shows the errors are not the printer's, quarter (mercy) is written quarters; Halle, Hallé; Lord Stirling, Sterling, etc. As mere narrative the style is very unequal. Occasionally it is easy and limpid, at times jerky and fragmentary, and again it is positively obscure.

One of the final chapters is devoted to Princeton authors and their productions, and, by an inclusion which at the ballot-box might be called repeating, the catalogue embraces not only publications issued or prepared at Princeton, or, at the furthest, by her emigrated children, but also comprehends all the writings of those who may at any time have had an actual, although temporary, residence there, whether published before their arrival or after their departure. Thus, valuable papers by Professor Young while at Dartmouth, by Professor Guyot while still abroad, by Professor Henry at the Smithsonian swell the list at the expense, it seems to us, of absolute fairness. Under these conditions there is counted an aggregate of five hundred and seventy-five volumes

* 'Princeton and its Institutions. By J. F. Hageman.' Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1879. 2 vols., pp. 359, 449, 8vo.

from seventy authors. The theological works issued from Princeton are numerous and important, and for nearly fifty years the *Princeton Review* was a constant and eloquent exponent of Princeton philosophy. But until very recently the literary sterility of the college gave color to the undergraduate tradition, that a provision in the charter forbade any of its professors while in possession of his office publishing a text-book or other volume.

RECENT POETRY.*

THESE six new dramatic idyls which Mr. Browning has given us are less marked than his later works by that perversity of manner which has so alienated his American readers that his last volumes have not been reprinted in this country; they are forcible, intense, clear-cut; they show the old grasp of the striking aspects of character, the familiar masterly touch in detail, but yet it goes almost without saying that they are hardly worthy of the companionship of those earlier idyls in which Mr. Browning found the freest scope for his powers in all their variety and fulness. One of them, 'Tray,' is not dramatic or idyllic in any sense, but is a poor satire; 'Pheidippides' is the story of the Athenian runner who was sent to Sparta to ask aid against the Persians, and on his return met the god Pan, who promised victory, and this poem rises to a lyrical fervor which none of the others possesses. But the four important idyls are "Martin Relph," "Halbert and Hob," "Ivan Ivanovitch," and "Ned Bratts," all of which are analyses of the retributive power of conscience. The latter two are the most varied and striking. Ivan Ivanovitch was a Russian carpenter. While at his work one day in winter, amid a group of his neighbors, a sledge came up drawn by a dying horse and holding a senseless woman; on reviving she tells how she had set out from a burning village with her three children, and had been pursued by wolves, which stole her children from her one by one, pulling them out of her arms with teeth and paw; as her story goes on it becomes clear to the bystanders that she has flung out her children to save herself, and as she falls at Ivan's feet—

"Solemnly
Ivan rose, raised his axe—for fitty, as he knelt,
Her head lay; well apart, each side, her arms hung—dealt
Lightning-swift thunder-strong one blow—no need of more!
Headless she knelt on still; that pine was sound at core
(Neighbors were used to say)—cast-iron-kernelled, which
Taxed for a second stroke Ivan Ivanovitch.

"The man was scant of words as strokes. 'It had to be:
I could no other: God it was bade 'act for me.'"

The villagers gather with the Stårosta and the Lord of the Land to judge the murder; the latter calls for sentence according to human law, but the Stårosta, an old priest of a hundred years, has learned other wisdom, and, after one of those long, closely-reasoned discourses in which Mr. Browning delights, proclaims Ivan "God's servant"; the neighbors find him at home building a toy Kremlin for his children—

"They told him he was free
As air to walk abroad. 'How otherwise?' asked he."

The other idyl we have chosen for mention opens in the court-house of Bedford, "quality-crammed," on a "broiling, blasting June," the judges sentencing "rank Puritans caught at prayer in a cow-house," gentry betting on the results of the trials, when in comes "publican Ned Bratts and Tabby his big wife too," "brass-bold, brick-built of beef and beer," "worst couple, rogue and quean, unchanged—search near and far"; in the midst of the hubbub, the heat and the sweat, they confess to murder, theft, adultery—tell how they have been converted by Bunyan's book, and ask to be hanged before they have an opportunity to fall from grace. Here is the tavern hag's account of Bunyan's words to her:

"Then all at once rose he;
His brown hair burst a-spread, his eyes were suns to see;
Up went his hands: 'Through flesh I reach, I read thy soul!
So may some stricken tree look blasted, bough and bole,
Champed by the fire-tooth, charred without, and yet, thrice-bound
With dremment about, within may life be found.

Woman, that tree art thou! all sloughed about with scurf,
Thy stag-horns fright the sky, thy snake-roots sting the turf!
Drunkness, wantonness, theft, murder gnash and gnarl
Thy outward, ease thy soul with coating like the marble
Satan stamps flat upon each head beneath his hoof!
And how deliver such? The strong men keep aloof,
Lover and friend stand far, the mocking ones pass by,
Tophet gapes wide for prey; lost soul, despair and die!
What then? "Look unto me, and be ye saved," saith God;
"I strike the rock, outstreams the life-stream at my rod!
Be your sins scarlet, wool shall they seem like; although
As crimson red, yet turn white as the driven snow."

So the judge gave credit for the conversion to the peaceful years of Charles's "pious reign," and the couple were "happily hanged"—

* Dramatic Lyrics. By Robert Browning. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1879.
Poems. Second Series. By Edmond G. A. Holmes. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

"Where Bunyan's statue stands facing where stood his jail."

Both of these idyls are worked out with a realism extraordinary even for Mr. Browning, so that the vividness of the description is sometimes sickening, as in the account of the death of the Russian mother, or the vigor of it sometimes unnecessarily gross, as in the talk of Ned Bratts to his wife. It will be seen that the poems are not idyllic in any ordinary sense of that word, nor are they dramatic in the sense that they are free from the author's personality. But there is no need to quarrel with terms; nor is there room for any but the old regret that Mr. Browning has mastered his art, not by subduing himself to it, but by dyeing it with his own nature.

The 'Poems' of Mr. Holmes describe his intellectual struggle rather than give the clear solution of his experience. The modern scepticism, with the attraction which nature-worship in some of its many mystical forms possesses for the poet who has lost hold of traditional faith, is the source and burden of most of his verses. In "Nature Lost and Found" he has expressed some moods of this spirit which have not often been revealed, but there is a haze over his thought even in this, which is one of the most carefully wrought of the poems. In others, where there is simple natural description or sentiment, he is more pleasing. This from "On Snowdon" will illustrate his style:

"the darkness of the night
Slowly became a pale and lifeless light
That touched with frosty red each orient cloud;
And ever, as the circling mists allowed,
A wilderness of mountains filled the sight—
Black island masses, round whose shores were tost
Billows of vapor—surging of a sea;
While to the West, in one vast crescent sweep,
Ran fifty leagues of dimly outlined coast,
Whose rocky headlands murmured voicelessly
The white-lipped moanings of the eternal deep."

The finest and most vigorous poem, it seems to us, is "Standing Still," the reflections of a common soldier under fire for the first time, and ordered only to hold his post. It is seldom that minor poetry rises to such a level of refinement, correctness, and thought as is shown throughout this volume.

'Briefs by a Barrister,' is so named, we are told, "more to assert the often-denied right of the Bar to express itself otherwise than in prose, than to mark the character of my verses." These verses were written as "relaxation," but they will be fortunate if they serve any of their readers so good a turn. "A Geological Romance," composed in college, is a creditable attempt by an undergraduate to write amusingly for undergraduates; but the other poems hardly deserve equal praise. Some are in the worst taste; these lines will indicate what the Barrister is capable of in the way of refinement:

"There would I with my love recline,
And pledging to our love divine
In brimming cups of ruby wine,
I'd lull her soul to ease and rest,
Until with love and wine oppress
She pillow'd lay upon my breast."

Every one knows that Alexander, "with love and wine at once oppress," sank on the breast of the "lovely Thaïs," but the example of Dryden will hardly excuse our poet. In execution he is either negligent or ignorant, and his intelligibility suffers both from the printer and from his own hand. This is his average of sentiment, and illustrates his finish:

"Ah, laughing eyes that can grow sad
Now gay and now how meek
Your language sweeter far than words
How can I gaze and speak?" (sic).

The right of the Bar "to express itself otherwise than in prose" hardly gains from such work.

'Nadescha' is a graceful story of Runeberg's, translated with more knowledge of Swedish than of blank-verse. It has the flavor of the soil which is always delightful in poetry from the North, and gives some indication of the talents of one of the best writers of modern Sweden; it is to be regretted that the technical part of the work is not better done.

Foreign Classics for English Readers. Edited by Mrs. Oliphant. Montaigne, by the Rev. Lucas Collins, M.A. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lipincott & Co.)—This set is as important, no doubt, as the original set of ancient classics. Our readers know the plan of both series: the presentation in a small volume and in readable style of an outline biography, an analysis of the writing, and a critical examination of the author and his work. This plan has been generally closely followed, although the

'Briefs by a Barrister. Occasional Verses. By Edward R. Johnes. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1879.

'Nadescha: A Poem in Nine Cantos. By Johan Ludvig Runeberg. Translated from the Swedish by Marie A. Brown. Boston: Published by Marie A. Brown, P. O. Box 900. 1879.

great differences in the nature of the tasks and the peculiar views taken of them by the different editors have brought it to pass that some are vastly more valuable than others. Thus, in the ancient series, the 'Caesar' by Mr. Trollope always seemed to us a masterpiece, for with scarcely a quotation, and in a continuous narrative, the great man and his writings are brought to our intimate acquaintance. With Montaigne and his essays this plan would hardly have done so well; and yet the complete division of this volume into chapters on "The Essayist in his Library," "Montaigne in Office," and the rest, is annoying. Caesar lived the two-fold life of man of action on the broadest stage and man of letters; but Montaigne lived one life only that is a life for us, and we had rather have seen his views and opinions and the whole body of his published thought, analyzed, divided, and subdivided under appropriate headings, than to be put off with so little about his 'Essays,' and so disproportioned an amount of information about the man and the small events of his earthly life. Of all writers Montaigne is the most discursive and his work the least systematized. A good index of seventy octavo pages,

in an edition beside us, fails to provide easy access to the mazes of his thought. And it is the more to be regretted, therefore, that it did not commend itself to the editor of this volume to devote his space to a fuller account of what Montaigne has to say. The most modern of essayists; the thinker who (as indeed Mr. Collins points out) saw two hundred years ago nobility and pathos in the lives of the poor, and proposed them in their patience and uncomplaining simplicity as a model to himself; the despiser of accusations of witchcraft, the denouncer of judicial torture, the advocate of the claims of dumb creatures to merciful treatment; the non-partisan in a day of civil war, the non-sectarian in a day of bloodshed and tyranny in the name of sects—this prince among critics and students deserves to be introduced to the modern world more completely than is done in this volume. Nevertheless, the long quotations are carefully translated from the crabbed original, and the view taken of the author's manner of thought, and of his opinions, and of his oddities is calm and just; we have read every word of the two hundred pages with pleasure.

MRS. ALEXANDER'S
NEW STORY,

Maid, Wife, or Widow?

Will be published on Saturday in the

LEISURE-HOUR SERIES.

HENRY HOLT & CO., NEW YORK.

F. W. CHRISTERN.

Foreign Bookseller and Importer,
186 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

The principal publications of Charpentier, Didier, Didot, Hachette, Levy, etc., on hand; also, complete sets of Tauchnitz's collection of British Authors and Teubner's Greek and Roman Classics. Catalogues mailed on demand. European Periodicals received weekly.

Heliotype.

Permanent Photographic Book Illustrations.

THE HELIOTYPE PRINTING COMPANY are producers of Book Illustrations by the Heliotype, Photo-lithographic, and Photo-engraving processes. Employed by the United States Government in illustrating Scientific and Medical Reports, by Scientific, Historical, and other learned Societies, by the leading publishers, and for illustrating Town and Family Histories, etc., etc.

Facsimiles of Medals and Coins, Ancient MSS., Paintings, Drawings and Sketches, Views and Portraits from Nature, Medical and Scientific objects, Antiquities, etc., etc.

For terms and specimens apply to the

HELIOTYPE PRINTING COMPANY,

220 Devonshire Street, Boston, Mass.

Fragrant Vanity Fair.

A NEW CIGARETTE.

Gotten up in honor of the Paris Award. Each Cigarette bears cut of the Paris Medal and brand, Parisian style. Our Tobacco and Cigarettes are better than ever, and unsurpassed for Purity, Delicacy, and Excellence. Special size Cigarettes, with any NAME, MONOGRAM, CREST, or DESIGN, to order, at 5¢ for 500. Samples on receipt of postage stamp. Samples of our Asthmatic and Catarrh Cigarettes, each, 25 cents by mail.

WM. S. KIMBALL & CO., Rochester, N. Y.

Peerless Tobacco Works.

Pratt's Astral Oil.

PERFECTLY SAFE.

Especially adapted for use in the St. Germain Student Lamp

CHAS. PRATT & CO.,

Box 3040.

NEW YORK

PATENT

Prepared Gasolene

FOR GAS-MACHINES.

Made by a new method; an absolutely pure article. Does not deteriorate in quality as the process of evaporation within the machine progresses. Every barrel guaranteed.

Address the manufacturers,

CHARLES PRATT & CO.

(Established 1770),

128 Pearl Street, New York.

THE

Meriden Britannia Co.

THE LARGEST MANUFACTORY OF ELECTRO-PLATED
WARE IN THE WORLD.

Salesrooms, No. 46 East Fourteenth Street,

UNION SQUARE,

NEW YORK.

We take much pleasure in referring to the reputation we have for many years maintained for manufacturing SPOONS AND FORKS BEARING THE TRADE-MARK "1847, ROGERS BROS."

Particular attention is invited to our Patented Process of Electro-Plating Spoons and Forks, by which the parts most exposed to wear receive an EXTRA COAT OF SILVER. This feature renders these goods more economical and durable than those of any other manufacture, while the increased cost is relatively small. This method of plating we apply to the 4, 8, and 12 oz. plate, as required.

To protect the purchaser against imitations, it should be observed that the Improved Spoons and Forks bear our Trade-Mark, "1847, ROGERS BROS., XII."

FIRST PREMIUMS awarded at all Fairs where exhibited, from the World's Fair, 1853, to American Institute Fairs, 1873, 1874, and 1875, inclusive, and at the Philadelphia Exhibition, 1876.

Extract from the American Institute Report:

"Their Porcelain-lined, Double-walled Ice Pitchers are At, and possess all the qualities the company claim." "We consider the goods made by this company to be by far the best made in this country, and we believe in the world."

HENRY B. BULT,

PRINT SELLER

RARE AND FINE LINE ENGRAVINGS,
ANCIENT PRINTS, PORTRAITS, ETC.
PRINTS FOR ILLUSTRATION

706 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

Province of Quebec

FIVE PER CENT

Gold Dollar and Sterling Bonds,

DUE 1908.

Principal and Interest Payable at the Bank of
Montreal, in New York or London.

FOR SALE BY

BLAKE BROTHERS & CO.,

54 WALL STREET.

BROWN BROTHERS & CO.
59 WALL STREET,

ISSUE COMMERCIAL AND TRAVELLERS' CREDITS

For use in

THIS COUNTRY AND ABROAD.

WINSLOW, LANIER & CO.,
BANKERS,

HAVE FOR SALE SECURITIES FOR SAFE AND PER-
MANENT INVESTMENT.

S. G. & G. C. WARD,
AGENTS FOR

BARING BROTHERS & COMPANY

52 Wall Street, New York.

26 State Street, Boston.

WILLIAM T. MEREDITH,
37 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK,

DEALER IN INVESTMENT SECURITIES AND COMMERCIAL PAPER.

KOUNTZE BROTHERS,
BANKERS,

12 WALL STREET, NEW YORK,

Issue LETTERS OF CREDIT or CIRCULAR NOTES on the
UNION BANK OF LONDON,
Available for Travellers in all parts of the world.

PHELPS, STOKES & CO.,
I. N. PHELPS,
JAMES STOKES,
ANSON PHELPS STOKES. BANKERS.

45 WALL STREET, NEW YORK,

ISSUE

TRAVELLERS' CREDITS

AND

CIRCULAR NOTES

ON THE UNION BANK OF LONDON,

Available throughout the World.

North Carolina and Virginia Bonds.

We will forward our Circulars concerning the New Funding laws of Virginia and North Carolina, and give detailed information to all holders who apply. Correspondence solicited.

THOS. BRANCH & CO., Bankers, etc.,
Richmond, Va.

WE ARE NOW FUNDING the Bonds of
Virginia and North Carolina.

We will send the new bonds promptly in exchange for the old. Forms for funding and all information furnished on application.

THOMAS BRANCH & CO.,
BANKERS, ETC., RICHMOND, VA.

his
not
ller
ts ;
red
em
lf ;
or-
nt ;
of
ties
om-
ons
n of
ties
ges

O.,

O.,

ER.

H,

ER.

S,

the

O.,

S,

ling
ion

of

l.

on.

A.